


JANUARY 7, 1984

\$1.75

TIME

MEN OF THE YEAR



Ronald Reagan

Yuri Andropov



Introducing: Plymouth You've got to drive



A Letter from the Publisher

The naming of U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet President Yuri Andropov as Men of the Year marks the third occasion on which the editors of TIME have made a double selection. In 1937 TIME named China's Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Madame Soong Mei-ling as Man and Wife of the Year for staunchly resisting the invading Japanese. Thirty-five years later, in 1972, President Richard Nixon and National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger were chosen for their efforts to realign U.S. diplomacy and end the Viet Nam War. Each of these pairings was made up of celebrated figures who shared not only cover space but a common goal. This year's choices, Reagan and Andropov, are the first antagonists to be named jointly.

The Man of the Year designation goes to the newsmaker who, for better or worse, has dominated the events of the preceding twelve months. Andropov is the third Soviet leader to be Man of the Year. Joseph Stalin was named in 1939 and again in 1942 because of his country's pivotal role in World War II. Nikita Khrushchev was named in 1957 for the Soviets' remarkable achievements in space.

The selection of a U.S. President is not unusual. Starting with Franklin Roosevelt, TIME's sixth Man of the Year, every President except Gerald Ford has been designated, most often as President-elect, since almost by definition anyone who en-



The President discusses the Soviets in his interview with TIME

ters and wins a U.S. presidential election dominates the year's news. Ronald Reagan, Jimmy Carter and Franklin Roosevelt were all chosen in their election years; Lyndon Johnson in 1964 and Harry Truman in 1948 were both Presidents and Presidents-elect, since they had succeeded to the office through their predecessors' deaths. Johnson was named twice (again in 1967), as was Richard Nixon (previously in 1971). Roosevelt achieved Man of the Year status a record three times: as President-elect (1932), as architect of the New Deal (1934) and as wartime leader (1941).

This issue's Men of the Year stories were supervised by Assistant Managing Editor John Elson and Senior Editor Henry Muller. The main narrative was the work of Senior Writer George Church, who drew extensively on the reporting of Diplomatic Correspondent Strobe Talbot, Moscow Bureau Chief Erik Amfithetorff, Eastern Europe Bureau Chief John Moody and White House Correspondent Laurence Barrett. Their efforts bring into distinctive focus for TIME's readers the most compelling story of 1983: the superpowers' confrontation, and the actions of the leaders who must cope with it.

John A. Meyers



MEN OF THE YEAR



16 Reagan and Andropov: One is the Great Communicator, the other a hidden spokesman for his nation. Their angry rhetoric epitomized the superpower confrontation that overshadowed all else in 1983.

36 The President Speaks: In an exclusive interview, Reagan shares his thoughts on the Soviet Union, the U.S. arms buildup, the allies, the Middle East and his controversial "focus of evil" phrase.

38 Recommendations: Eight world statesmen, including two heads of government and a former U.S. President, offer specific advice on how to reduce the level of global tension in the months ahead.

42 Superpower Relations: Postwar U.S.-Soviet history can be summed up in a vocabulary of its own: from cold war, containment and brinkmanship to détente, linkage and deadlock.

46 What Americans Think: An opinion sampling and a special TIME poll find that many are anxious about war but not antagonistic to the Soviet people—and they want Reagan to meet Andropov now.

52 The Runners-Up: U.S. servicemen, shouldering worldwide burdens, a traveling Pope with a message of peace, an "Iron Lady" with a renewed mandate; the judge in charge of the A T & T breakup.

54

Nation

Pressure to withdraw from Lebanon mounts. ▶ A House report faults U.S. security in Beirut. ▶ Indian bingo is booming.

72

Design

Bowing to the past as they shape the future, the year's best buildings and products strive to be "user friendly."

80

Music

A 16-LP set documents the vocal art of that great Italian baritone Frank Sinatra. ▶ The best classical, pop and jazz of 1983.

91

Cinema

Tom Conti is a shaggy dog of a poet in the movie of Peter De Vries' *Reuben, Reuben*. ▶ The year's finest films.

60

Economy & Business

High growth and low inflation in a banner year. ▶ Merry Christmas bonuses are up. ▶ The GM-Toyota deal is approved.

75

Video

In the television tradition of taboo breaking, a new ABC movie treats incest with calculated prudence. ▶ The best of 1983.

83

Books

An editor's memoir shows why London had *Good Times*. ▶ J.M. Coetzee writes an allegory of unrest.

92

Show Business

Want to see a movie, a Broadway show, the Super Bowl? Just pick up your phone; computers do the rest. ▶ 1983's ten most.

64

World

Japanese voters hand Prime Minister Nakasone a setback. ▶ Egypt's Mubarak and the P.L.O.'s Arafat embrace in Cairo.

78

Sport

He is rich, fast and beautiful, and a fantastic sex life is before him: Devil's Bag, the \$36 million wonder horse.

90

Theater

A Broadway musical and a Brooklyn gospel show probe the black experience in white America. ▶ The best plays of the year.

8 Letters

74 Press


79 People


82 Education

82 Milestones

Cover: Painting by Alfred Leslie

**WE'RE INSURING THE OLYMPICS BECAUSE
OUR BUSINESS IS ENSURING PEOPLE'S DREAMS.**





This year, Transamerica Insurance and Transamerica Occidental Life will insure the Olympic Games.

Providing accident and health insurance for every athlete, trainer and coach.

Providing liability insurance for the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee to cover its obligations to every spectator and Olympic site.

It's a tremendous undertaking. Yet the same kind of total commitment we're making to the Olympic Games, we make to every individual or group we insure.

Because our business is ensuring people's dreams.

Transamerica. Insurance. Finance. Manufacturing. Transportation. Innovation.



Transamerica 

THE POWER OF THE PYRAMID IS WORKING FOR YOU.

Letters

Fair Press?

To the Editors:

Over the years, I have come to think of the press as a puppeteer who wants to control every facet of our lives. Your article "Journalism Under Fire" (Dec. 12) confirms my opinion. Serve us. Do not rule us.

Martha H. Huey
Atlanta

I have never seen any group so bitter and hostile as the television newscasters who were denied the right, which they consider constitutional and God-given, to cover the Grenada invasion. These are the same individuals who trampled the rights and privacy of others by engaging in the unbelievably tasteless pursuit of families awaiting news of loved ones in the Beirut suicide bombing. The press serves a valuable function, but it has built too lofty a pedestal on which to display it.

Howard F. Bowles Jr.
Newtown, Conn.



Sure, the press has its faults. But God help us if the press, the only watchdog we have on the Government and other institutions, ever loses its freedom.

Frank K. Seifert
Minneapolis

The American people will continue to be suspicious of the press until it becomes a nonprofit and independent public corporation. In our country no industry should have such awesome power and at the same time be protected by the First Amendment.

Edward J. Powers
Fort Myers, Fla.

Conservative critics who say that the press is biased toward the left show how isolated we are from the rest of the world. Of the 1,700 daily newspapers in the U.S., name a single one that has the slightest doubts about the divinity of capitalism.

Abbie Hoffman
New York City

Why were none of TIME's excesses reported? Physician, heal thyself.

Mark Johnson
New York City

A free press is absolutely essential, but the flap over Grenada shows that spoiled brats represent it.

Arthur H. Hanson
Stockton, Calif.

If journalism is under fire, then TIME's shoddy reporting of one episode with which I have some familiarity merits further fire from the public.

Over a picture of me interviewing General William Westmoreland, you write, "Fairness can be sacrificed when reporters go into a story with a preconceived thesis." Yes, it can. But fairness will not be sacrificed if that thesis is tested. And we did test it. When CBS News went into research for *The Uncounted Enemy: A Viet Nam Deception*, we talked with over 100 different sources. Many of them substantiated the charges of "cooking the books" by Military Assistance Command intelligence officers in Viet Nam during 1967 and 1968. Some did not. Both sides of that research were taken into account during the reporting, filming and assembling of the documentary.

Strangely, you failed to report that CBS News stands by the substance of the broadcast. And though your reporter had been briefed by me and others about material proving the thrust of the broadcast, you failed to report any of it. I look forward to the day, after the litigation is over, when Americans who did not see the broadcast the first time around will have the opportunity to view it and determine for themselves whether charges of corrupt intelligence practices leveled not by us, but by former high-ranking intelligence officers from the military and the CIA, were or were not accurate.

Mike Wallace
CBS News, 60 Minutes
New York City

I read with dismay the comment by Barbara Walters. She says, "The news media in general are liberal. If you want to be a reporter, you are going to see poverty and misery, and you have to be involved in the human condition." Walters' premise is that only a liberal cares about those in dire straits or has the answer to the problem. How untrue. How unfair. How naive. How typical.

Delmar G. Esau
Sebastopol, Calif.

Mayor Hatcher of Gary has the right to repeat his litany of complaints about his home-town newspaper. He and TIME ought to make sure his complaints are factual before printing them. Unfortunately, Hatcher's two examples of the *Post-Tribune's* "unfairness" to him are false. He says the paper "never even wrote the story" about a study of municipal fiscal poli-

cy where Gary came out No. 1. The *Post-Tribune* did publish two stories. Hatcher also complains, "I was just re-elected with 90% of the vote. After the election the *Post-Tribune* wrote in an editorial: 'There is no consensus on his leadership among the people of Gary.'" Yes, Hatcher was re-elected in November with a huge majority, but the Republicans did not field a candidate. The real election was the earlier Democratic primary, which Hatcher won with only 53.3% of the vote.

James G. Driscoll, Editor
Post-Tribune
Gary, Ind.

The American people have never forgiven the press for Watergate—not because the press caused the situation, but because journalists reveled in it. Former President Nixon may have sealed his own fate, but the pursuit of him by the press was almost too cruel to witness. It was like dogs cornering a wounded hare.

Gail Funaro
Cerritos, Calif.

A free press will make mistakes. That is its freedom. It is the public's duty to evaluate the information. I hope we will never read that our President is suffering his eighth week of a severe cold.

Edward A. Espinoza
Carmel, Calif.

Part of my job as a small-town newspaper editor is to field complaints, many of which are similar to those noted in your story. I find that the most difficult thing is to narrow the objections down to specifics. Plenty of people tell us what we should not do, but few let us know what they want of us.

Thomas W. Pantera, Editor
Cumberland Advocate
Cumberland, Wis.

Yes, I am rude, accusatory and cynical. I have been accused of being unpatriotic, anti-Israeli, anti-Arab and anti-American. I meddle in politics, harass illegal businesses and cause other untold difficulties for governments. Some say I am arrogant and self-righteous. I am glad. That is what makes good reporters.

David Browde
WNEW-TV
New York City

During my 16 years as the public affairs officer for a U.S. agency in Europe, I was never misquoted. However, it is my observation that deadlines often assume more importance than the need to get complete information. Too often, interviews resemble inquisitions, and cute phrases take precedence over hard facts. I have marveled at how different a story turns out after it is rewritten from the wire-service account, even when the quotes remain absolutely correct.

Allan Dale Olson
Karlsruhe, West Germany

Suddenly, my copier's minding everyone's business.

I should have known.
My Canon Personal
Cartridge copier is so ingenious,
people are finding all kinds of ways
to use it.

Especially people in business. Why
they're using it in ways I never dreamed of.

Take my Canon PC-10 for example. It makes

beautiful copies. On plain paper. Which is just what business people are
looking for. And it's so small, they can have one anywhere. On their desks for
instance. Or even a countertop.

My Canon PC-20 gives business a bit more. With a copy speed of
8 copies a minute. And a paper cassette that holds up to
100 sheets to keep the copies coming. Now several
busy people can share one.

But what everybody really likes about my copiers
is how easy they are to maintain. All you have to do is change a cartridge.

That's because the entire copying process—the toner, the drum and
the developer—is inside a neat replaceable cartridge.
Good for about 2,000 copies.

Better still, the PC Copiers do something no other copiers can: They
copy in black, brown or blue, just by changing the cartridge. Tremendous.

If you've been wondering about the price, relax. It's so low almost
every business can afford
their own PC Copier.

Canon Personal
Cartridge copiers.
If I were you,

I'd make it my business to look into
one today.

Canon PC-10/20

Personal Cartridge Copying, Plain and Simple.™



Canon PC-10
\$995*

Canon PC-20
\$1,295*

Canon PC Cartridges
\$65 in black
\$70 in brown or blue

*suggested retail price exclusive of cartridge

For more information about Canon Personal Cartridge Copiers,
call toll free 1-800-234-7411 Ext. 999. In New Jersey 1-800-524-4881 Ext. 999.
Or mail to: Canon U.S.A., Inc., P.O. Box 3073, Edison, NJ 07033.

1-800-234-7411
1-800-524-4881
1-800-524-4881
1-800-524-4881
1-800-524-4881



Letters

Americans get what they thirst for: stories of violence and war. The problem is not the press but the human condition.

*John Bunch
New York City*

Irresponsible editors and smug television anchors brought distrust of the press the old-fashioned way. They earned it.

*Alain Wood-Prince
Lake Forest, Ill.*

Cheer up, TIME. You are not one-half as bad as television.

*Miriam S. Monroe
Harrison, Me.*

The most startling revelation is the number of people who support censorship. A free press is anathema to Communism, fascism, Nazism and, apparently, America's conservatives.

*Alexander F. Livingstone
Franklin, N.H.*

When publishers adopt as their credo "Is this fair?" rather than "Will this sell?" reporters will quickly follow suit.

*Jim Austin
Sterling, Ill.*

Pay no attention to the carpers who say that the press is unpatriotic or should support the President's policies. These

complainers would settle for a government without a strong press or without any press. There is a name for that kind of government, and it ain't democracy.

*Charles Curry
Hubbard, Ohio*

The news media are too quick to be "Monday-morning quarterbacks." If television commentators know all the right answers and can so quickly assess every new development, why are they not running the country?

*Chester E. Morrison
Port Charlotte, Fla.*

Many people do not realize that human rights cannot be maintained without freedom of the press. Criticize our press but do not crush it, for then all is lost.

*Merle Martin
Wooster, Ohio*

The criticism of the press is due in large measure to an ever increasing torrent of unwelcome news borne by a messenger that is perceived to be officious. It is frightening to see an insecure citizenry seek refuge from this bad news by surrendering its freedoms, particularly the right to a free press, which so many have sacrificed their lives to preserve.

*Colin Languedoc
New York City*

Part of the problem is that some journalists force themselves on unsuspecting or helpless people. Before questions are asked, maybe a statement should be read: "You have the right not to respond. If you choose to respond, anything you say can be used by the news. You have the right to terminate the interview at any time."

*John B. Prior
Plainview, Texas*

Sorry, but this television journalist will not be scrambling aboard the "soul searchers' " wagon. Certainly we have our faults, but we are striving to correct them. The major problem in journalism today is not our alleged poor performance. It is that most Americans do not believe the press should be free to print and broadcast things that upset them.

*John W. Whelan Jr.
Evanston, Ill.*

I will take Dan Rather's version of the facts over Ronald Reagan's any day.

*Scott Tucker
Seattle*

Considering that you are viewing the press from the inside, TIME handled the subject honestly. Most journalists are sincere and do a good job of making Americans the best-informed people. The media's sins of rudeness, arrogance, in-



WONDERWAGO

sensitivity and overzealousness are shared by the rest of us. But what distinguishes the press from the public is that journalists have power and they abuse it.

*Euell Augustine
Thousand Oaks, Calif.*

Vive la presse! People like things simple. But life is complex. When the press reports complexities, simple minds become annoyed. So, reporters, go on covering reality as you see it.

*Eric W. Johnson
Philadelphia*

Your story discussing the sins of the press called to mind a saying I once heard: "A journalist is someone who does not know what he is talking about but says it very well."

*Todd Gibson
Marion, Iowa*

Castrating Rapists

The three men who raped an 80-lb. woman [Dec. 12] are terrified by the judge's sentence of castration or prison. Commenting on their dilemma, a law professor says that castration may be no more cruel than incarceration because in prison "you can be gang raped." Gang rape is something these men seem to approve of. They committed it.

*Charles D. Poe
Houston*

Rape frequently is an act of sadistic rage resulting from drives far more complex than pure sexual desire. Quite often, sexual climax is not achieved during rape. Thus a castrated rapist might become even more sadistically enraged.

*Thomas W. Dugdale, M.D.
Hartford, Conn.*

Castration or prison? Why not both?

*Kathryn Tankuns
Killington, Vt.*

Dogless Peking

The meticulous extermination of dogs that is currently taking place in Peking [Dec. 12] reflects man's return to a savage state. Not only are we selfish, but we inflict cruelty upon the less-developed species. It is naive to expect men to coexist peacefully with one another when we permit such genocides to occur.

*Alejandro Nusenovich
Worcester, Mass.*

Your report on the government-sponsored drive to remove all dogs from Peking illustrates how public policy can run amuck. Research shows that humans can benefit from their relationship with animals. Banning dogs from China's capital could prestage even more horrendous policies toward other "troublesome" populations like the nonproductive old and poor, the deformed, the retarded, the diseased

and the unwanted young. More enlightened municipal approaches than Peking's current destruction of these poor canines are called for. We must preserve the respect and reverence for all life that are so inherently necessary for species survival, including our own.

*John F. Kullberg, Executive Director
American Society for the Prevention of
Cruelty to Animals
New York City*

Ivy Football

How could you mention Harvard football [Dec. 12] without printing the famous cheer, "Repel them! Repel them! Make them relinquish the ball"?

*Warren E. Peterson
Seattle*

Your report of the Harvard-Yale football game is obviously the product of an embittered Princetonian whose application was rejected by both Harvard and Yale.


*William G. Wood, Yale '31
Princeton, N.J.*

*Writer Skow (Oberlin '53) was not rejected
by Harvard or Yale. He never applied.*

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR should be addressed to TIME, Time & Life Building, Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y. 10020, and should include the writer's full name, address and home telephone. Letters may be edited for purposes of clarity or space.

© 1983 Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.

The 1984 Toyota Van. We call it WonderWagon. You'll call it terrific. Leave it to Toyota to invent a totally new concept in transportation — a body designed to be so sleek and trim it's the first modern garageable van.



It combines the handling, maneuverability and comfort of a car with the space of a van. It has 7-passenger seating or 1500 lb.* cargo capacity and almost 150 cubic feet of space.

The Toyota Van's wedge-shaped design results in a drag coefficient of .40, better than any van in the US. This crisp, aerodynamic styling and a powerful 2.0 liter electronically fuel injected engine, give it 31 Estimated Highway, 25 EPA Estimated MPG.**

Not only does the Toyota Van have versatile rear seats that can be removed to make room for cargo, but look at what

OH WHAT A FEELING!
TOYOTA

else it has. Plush velour upholstery and deep, luxuriant carpeting. And you can even get a

4-speed automatic overdrive transmission, power windows and door locks, a dual air conditioning system, and would you believe it, even an ice-maker and two sun roofs. All these features plus one more.

The low Toyota sticker price.*** It really is a wonder no one thought of it before.

*Includes occupants, equipment and cargo

**Remember: Compare this estimate to the "EPA Estimated MPG" of other cars with manual transmission. You may get different mileage, depending on how fast you drive, weather conditions and trip length. Actual highway mileage will probably be less than the "Highway Estimate."

***Based on manufacturer's suggested retail price. Actual dealer price may vary.

BUCKLE UP—IT'S A GOOD FEELING!

INTRODUCING THE NEW TOYOTA VAN.
IT'S A WONDER
NO ONE THOUGHT OF IT BEFORE.

Self-Therapy for the STUTTERER

Send for this
184-page
self-therapy book
describing how
stutterers can help
themselves. \$2.50
(plus \$1.00 handling charge)

Speech Foundation of America

P.O. Box 11749
Memphis, TN 38111

A non-profit organization

EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE

TIME & LIFE BUILDING
ROCKEFELLER CENTER
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10020

Time Inc. also publishes FORTUNE, SPORTS ILLUSTRATED, MONEY, PEOPLE, LIFE, DISCOVER and, in conjunction with its subsidiaries, the international editions of TIME. President & Chief Executive Officer, J. Richard Munro; Chairman of the Board, Ralph P. Davidson; Executive Vice President, Clifford J. Grum; Chief Financial Officer, H.J. Nicholas Jr.; Group Vice President & Secretary, Charles B. Bear; Group Vice Presidents, Joe C. Denman Jr., Gerald M. Levin, Joan D. Mantley, Kelso F. Sutton; Corporate Vice President—Law, E. Gabriel Perle; Corporate Vice President—Public Affairs, Donald M. Wilson; Vice President, C.G. Ames Jr.; Vice President & Treasurer, E. Thayer Bigelow; Vice Presidents, Frank J. Biondi Jr., Reginald K. Brack Jr., Joseph J. Collins, Brian Conboy, Winston H. Cox, Lawrence M. Crotcher, Carlyle C. Daniel; Vice President & Controller, Kevin L. Doan; Vice Presidents, David H. Dolben, Richard J. Durrell, Edward E. Fitzgerald, J. Winston Fowkes, Michael J. Fuchs, James O. Heyworth, R. Bruce Hilland, Philip G. Howlett, James R. Kerr, Edward Patrick Lemanhan, Jean J. McCuskey, S. Christopher Meigher III, John A. Meyers, Trygve E. Myhren, P. Peter Sheppe, Robert M. Steed, Richard B. Thomas, Arthur H. Thornhill Jr.; Assistant Secretaries, William M. Guttman, Carolyn K. McCandless; Assistant Treasurers, John M. Fahey Jr., Janine W. Hill, Urban L. Uebelhor; Assistant Controllers, Eugene Farro, Richard F. Schnabel; Editor-in-Chief, Henry Grunwald; Corporate Editor, Jason McManus.

TIME introduces THE GAME.

Here at last is a game worthy of you.

It's a question/answer game that challenges your knowledge of people, places and events that have been in the news during TIME's seven decades. There are over 8,000 intriguing questions, and a special section for children, too.

Play THE GAME for an hour or a week.

Play against one opponent or whole teams.

Play THE GAME anywhere—it's as compact and portable as a hardcover novel. Now at any fine store that caters to great minds. Or, order yours today.

© 1983 Time Inc.



The price of THE GAME, including shipping and handling, is 29.95*

Order to: **TIME, THE GAME**
P.O. Box 22920, Rochester, N.Y. 14692
Or call toll-free 800-828-6221 (In New York, 800-462-6432)

Print Name _____

Address _____ Tel. # (_____) _____

City _____ State _____ Area Code _____ Zip _____

No. of Games _____ Total \$ _____ * Make checks payable to TIME, THE GAME

Check one: Check enclosed Bill my MasterCard VISA

Acct. # _____ Expires _____
Month _____ Year _____

Signature _____

(Must be signed to be valid for charge)

*Residents of New York and California, please add applicable state and local taxes. Please allow 4 to 6 weeks for delivery. 1-782-01-02

TIME

Founders: BRITON HAZDEN 1823-1829 HENRY R. LUCE 1898-1967

Editor-in-Chief: Henry Austin Grunwald

President: J. Richard Munro

Chairman of the Board: Ralph P. Davidson

Corporate Editor: Jason McManus

Group Vice President, Magazines: Kelso F. Sutton

Executive Vice President, Magazines: Philip G. Howlett

MANAGING EDITOR: Ray Caw

EXECUTIVE EDITORS: E. Howard L. Jamieson, Arnold Kravitz

ASSISTANT MANAGING EDITORS: Walter Kropf, Richard Duncan, John Jackson

INTERNATIONAL EDITOR: Karsten Praeger

SENIOR EDITORS: David Brand, Martha M. Duffy, William F. Ewald, Joel M. Ferrer III, Stefan Funtke, Donald Gossman, Henry Holsinger, Christopher Hubbard, Stephen Smith, George M. Tabor

ART DIRECTOR: Hubert Hoglund

CHIEF OF RESEARCH: Leah Shanks Gordon

OPERATIONS DIRECTOR: Gérard C. Leblanc

PICTURE EDITOR: Arnold H. Dragoin

SENIOR WRITERS: George J. Church, Gerald Clarke, Michael Demaree, Otto Friedrich, Andrew Gorn, Paul Gray, Robert Hughes, T. E. Kahn, Ed Magnuson, Lance Morrow, Fredrick Pastore, Roger Rosenblatt, R. J. Shoppard, William E. Smith, Frank Trippe

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: John Anderson, Patricia Blake, Tom Callahan, Richard Corliss, Spencer Danaban, John S. DeMott, John Greenwood, William A. Henry III, Russ Hoyle, Walter Isaacson, Gregory Jaynes, Margaret Johnson, James Kelly, John Lee, John Nelson, Richard N. Osting, Sue Raftery, J. J. Rank, George Rieder, Alexander L. Taylor III, Leon Thomas, Mary Yates Parly Vega, Michael Walsh

STAFF WRITERS: Charles P. Alexander, Kenneth W. Bartis, Janice Castro, Walter R. Clark, Frank J. Conroy, John J. Corry, Johnathan, Elie McGrath, Sara C. Medina, Jay D. Palmer, Michael S. Serrin, Alessandro Sforza, Richard Steingel, Susan Telft, Anastasia Tsoy, Claudia Wadia, Louis Wright

CONTRIBUTORS: Jay Cocks, Thomas Griffith, Charles Krauthammer, Melvin Madoff, James O'Reilly, Kenneth H. Poyne, Richard Schickel, John Skow, W. W. Winkler

REPEATER RESEARCHERS: Annelise Hatcher, Joe Galle, Mary Lane, Betty Satterfield, Janet S. (Department Heads), Audrey Ball, Peggy T. Bernier, Rosemary Byrnes, Nancy McD. Chase, Oscar Chang, Elaine Oakes, Peter Rosen, Anne Higgins, Nancy Newman, James Newhouse, Susan M. Reed, Vicky Jones Sparks, Suzanne Woodruff, Rosemary Tardiff, Jeanne Zadok (Senior Staff): George Anstee, Bernard Baumall, Richard Brack, Robert J. Burrows, Mary Carpenter, Valeriya Cherkov, Susan San Diego, Richard Decker, Kathryn Scott, Felton, Mary Ann French, Cassie J. Ferguson, Christina Garcia, Nelida Gonzalez-Alfonso, Robert J. Green, Michael P. Harris, Geraldine Kirzhelzhan, Stephen Kojan, John L. Kuhn, Maria Ruzhicki, S. Beth Kurland, Anne Murphy, Johnathan Jacobson, David O'Hara-Foster, John Podreutz, George P. Poswick, Brian Riemann, Jeffrey A. Robinson, Elizabeth Rubin, John S. Sanders, Marlene H. Sanders, William H. Steiner, Sidney Ughart, Jane Van Tassel, Linda Young

ADMINISTRATOR: Charlotte J. Guggie

CORRESPONDENTS: Ian Galt (Chief), Dean Fischer, R. Edward Jackson, B. William Mader (Deputy), Washburn Contracting Editor: Hudson Diplomatic

EDITORIAL SECRETARIES: Sherrill Talbot

SENIOR CORRECTORS: Ruth Mohamed Galvin, William Rademacher, Sandy Smith, Peter Steiler, Frederick Ungehner

WASHINGTON: Robert J. Amico, Barrett Solomon, Sam Alts, Lawrence J. Barnett, David Beckwith, Greer Boyle, Jay Brasinger, Douglas Brew, Alan Constable, Patricia Delaney, Hays Green, Jerry Harwood, Neil MacNeil, Johannes McGree, Moss H. Moran, Bruce W. Nelson, Christopher Redden, Gregory H. Wierzbicki, William W. Wood

NEW YORK: John S. Clark, Jonathan Beatty, Robert Carney, Dorothy Featherhough, Marco Garcia, Thomas McCarrall, Janice C. Simpson, Elizabeth S. Sponk, Julie Kitzinger, James Earl Atallah, Joseph H. Boyce, B. J. Phillips, John E. Yag

HOUSTON: David S. Jackson CHICAGO: Christopher Guggie, J. Riedinger, Neil Greig, Tom Hirsch, Richard J. Lippman, Paul J. Waters, Barbara B. Doherty DEVER: Robert C. Wurrofford SAN FRANCISCO: William R. Doerner, Michael Wright, Dick Thompson, Les Angeles: Benjamin W. Cole, Ricardo Davera, Steven Holmes, Joseph J. Paris, James Lorick, Richard Woodbury, Dennis Rowley

EUROPE: Lawrence Malkin London: Bonnie Angelo, Mary Cronin, Arthur White, John Korte, Jonathan Wainwright, Robert Wainwright, Robert Farnes, Gary Lee

EAST: John Moody Rome: Wilton Wynn, Barry Kalf Jerusalem: Henry Kalf, David Hery Middle East: William Stewart Beirut: Roberto Sosa Bahrain: Bruce Hilland

NEW DELHI: Don Brink Tokyo: Owen M. Rongstad, S. Chang Melbourne: John Dunes Canada: John M. Scott, Ed Gray Mexico City: James O'Brien

NEW YORK: Timothy Loughran Caribbean: William McWhorter, Bernard Deshotel

NEW YORK: Suzanne Dery, Robert M. Gribble, Katherine Gray, Susan, David Richardson, Jean R. White, Arthur Vahle, Allison France, Blanche Polak, Ann Deary

ADMINISTRATION: Debra D'Amico

ART: Neil Robinson, Irene Barbo (Deputy Directors); Arturo Cazanove, Rene Klein, Leon S. Levine, Anthony J. Libardi, William Spencer (Assistant Directors); Ray Ho, John White

ASSISTANT ART DIRECTORS: Irene, Dorothy A. Chapman, Richard A. Nadelman, Lee Lay

OVER: Burg Nargelwala (Chief); John P. Dowd, John F. Geist (Deputies); Joseph Anderson, James Kenney, David Duchs Burman, William Bennett, Anne Steeles, Ray Thorne

MAIL AND CHIEF: Paul J. Pugliese, E. Noel McKee, Nina Tetak, Deborah L. Wells

SPECIAL PROJECTS: Tom Benkowski

PHOTOGRAPHY: Michele Stepien (Deputy); Demetra Koster, Helen Eisenberg (Assistant Photographers); Evelyn Morris, Richard L. Booth, Anne Callahan, Martha L. Haymaker, Paula Horner, Peter J. Keller, Rose Keyser, Susan Lombardi, Eva Nutt, Neil, Julia Scher, Arthur Sauer, Nancy S. Spector, Robert S. Taylor, Robert J. Taylor, Ray Thorne

PHOTOGRAPHERS: Eddie Adams, Walter Bennett, Salem Doherty, Budi Fryer, Arthur Gold, Harold Harshbarger, David Hume, Helen May, Emily Mitchell, James D. Murtagh, Ralph Morse, Carl Mydans, Stephen Northup, Bill Fereid, David Rubinger, Ted, Diana Walker, John Zimmerman

MAKEUP: Charles P. Jackson (Chief); Eugene F. Coyle (International); Leonard Schanin (Deputy); Peter J. McCallum

OPERATIONS: Sue Arkin (Deputy Director); Susan L. Blair (Copy Chief); Stephen F. Dineen (Systems Manager); Le S. Sparks (Production Editor); Ernest Gray, Judith Anne

EDITORIAL: John J. Scalfari (Deputies); Ruth Lu Ching, Gary Death, Susi Romanik, L. Rufino

EDITORIAL: Shirley Egan, Robert G. Gorman, Robert G. Gorman, Anne Steeles, Ray Thorne

NADINE BURTON (Chief); Kenneth Callahan, Manuel Delgado, Leo Dunitz, Lucia Hamer, Evelyn Hamilton, Gary Heine, Judith Kales, Theresa Kessler, Clare Kohn, Aghoshin, Julia Jean-Louis, Mary Jane, Mary McInerney, Helen May, Emily Mitchell, James D. Murtagh, Carl Muro, Maria A. Paul, Anna Riedinger, Megan Rutherford, Robert Schepman, Lina Shea, Robert J. Soto, Jill Soto, Alan Washburn

LETTERS: Joan D. Walsh (Chief); Isabel F. Kouri (Deputy)

EDITORIAL SERVICES: Christina Wallard (Director); Herbert G. Orth, Benjamin Lightman, Alex Stach, Elizabeth G. King

PUBLISHER: John A. Meyers

General Manager: Michael J. Kingnessmith

Promotion Director: Robert D. Sweeney

Circulation Director: George P. Berger

Circulation Director: Eric C. Throckmold

Business Manager: Arthur G. Sachs

ASSOCIATE PUBLISHER-ADVERTISING SALES DIRECTOR: Richard E. Thomas

U.S. Advertising Sales Director: John J. Crowley Jr.

U.S. Advertising Sales Director: Charles D. Hagan



To unlock your body's potential, we proudly offer Soloflex. Twenty-four traditional iron pumping exercises, each correct in form and balance. All on a simple machine that fits in a corner of your home.

For a free Soloflex brochure, call anytime
1-800-453-9000.

**BODY BY
SOLOFLEX®**

SOLOFLEX,® HILLSBORO, OREGON 97123
VIDEO BROCHURE AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST

©1983 SOLOFLEX

SMOKERS

U.S. GOV'T REPORT:

No Brand Lower Than Carlton Box King-

Less than 0.5 mg. tar, 0.05 mg. nic.

19th Consecutive Report: No Brand Listed Lower Than Carlton

Warning: The Surgeon General Has Determined
That Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Your Health.

Box: Less than 0.5 mg. "tar", 0.05 mg. nicotine;
Menthol: Less than 0.5 mg. "tar", 0.1 mg. nicotine; Soft Pack
and 100's Box: 1 mg. "tar", 0.1 mg. nicotine
av. per cigarette, FTC Report Mar. '83.


King, Menthol or Box 100's:

A whole carton of Carlton has less tar than a single pack of...

...KINGS			...100's		
	TAR Mg./Cig.	NICOTINE Mg./Cig.		TAR Mg./Cig.	NICOTINE Mg./Cig.
Kent	12	0.9	Kent 100's	14	1.1
Winston Lights	11	0.8	Winston Lights 100's	12	0.8
Marlboro	16	1.1	Benson & Hedges 100's	16	1.1
Salem	15	1.0	Parliament Lights 100's	12	0.9
Kool Mids	11	0.8	Salem 100's	15	1.1
Newport	16	1.1	Marlboro 100's	17	1.1

TAR & NICOTINE NUMBERS AS REPORTED IN LATEST FTC REPORT

Carlton Kings	1	0.1			
Carlton Menthol	Less than 0.5	0.1	Carlton Box 100's	1	0.1



Box King—lowest of all brands—less than 0.01 mg. tar, 0.002 mg. nic.

Carlton is lowest.




MEN OF THE YEAR

TIME/JANUARY 2, 1984

"They are the focus of evil in the modern world."

RONALD REAGAN

March 8, 1983



In the beginning were the words. At the top, verbal missiles fired in magisterial wrath: Ronald Reagan denouncing the Soviet Union as an "evil empire" that had committed "a crime against humanity" when its fighters shot down a Korean jetliner; Yuri Andropov responding that the Reagan Administration had "finally dispelled" all "illusions" that it could be dealt with. At a baser level, crude vilification: American caricatures of Andropov as a "mutant from outer space"; Soviet comparisons of Reagan to Adolf Hitler.

After the words, the walkouts. "Everything is finished!" Soviet Negotiator Yuli Kvitsinsky proclaimed, as he stomped out of a meeting with his U.S. counterpart, Paul Nitze. Four days later, the U.S.S.R. broke off the Geneva INF (Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces) talks on limiting missiles in Europe. The U.S. "would still like to launch a decapitating nuclear first strike," Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, the

“They violate elementary norms of decency.”

YURI ANDROPOV
September 28, 1983

Soviet armed forces Chief of Staff, charged at a remarkable news conference, as he rapped a long metal pointer against a wall chart showing U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals.

By year's end the Kremlin let two other negotiations drift into limbo. It refused to set a date for resuming either the Geneva START talks on reducing the numbers of long-range nuclear weapons or the decade-long Vienna bargaining on cutting conventional forces in Europe. The suspensions left the superpowers for the first time in 14 years with no arms-control talks of any kind in progress and with even regular diplomatic contacts frosty.

Now, in the silence, come the missiles, no longer metaphorical but physical and nuclear. U.S. Pershing IIs, looking incongruously toylike with their bright red and



MEN OF THE YEAR

yellow stripes, being deployed in West Germany. In Britain and Italy, Tomahawk cruise missiles, sleek, innocent-looking and small enough to fit into a pickup truck, all targeted on the Soviet Union. On the other side, Soviet mobile rockets going into Czechoslovakia and East Germany, aimed at U.S. allies in Europe. Tomorrow, perhaps, Soviet depressed-trajectory ballistic missiles on submarines off America's Atlantic shores, capable of hitting Washington as rapidly as the Pershing IIs could strike, say, Minsk: twelve to 15 minutes after firing.

Following the missiles, fear and

death from freezing and starvation. Some 100 million Americans watched *The Day After*, a frightful TV visualization of nuclear blast, fire and radiation.* In Western Europe, demonstrations against the missiles made up in hysteria for anything they might have lacked in numbers. Hundreds of thousands of peace marchers paraded in West Germany, some wearing mourning clothes or displaying faces painted white to resemble death masks. Hundreds of women chained themselves to the fence at Greenham Common airbase in Britain to protest the unloading of U.S. cruise missiles in tarpaulin-draped cartons from giant droop-winged transport planes.

What *could* happen, of course, is by no means what necessarily, or even probably, will happen. The U.S. and the Soviet Union have not reached *The Day Before* the missiles fly. Indeed, Washington and Moscow share a keen apprehension not only of the terrible power of their nuclear weapons but also of the danger that any shooting at all between their forces could conceivably bring those weapons into use. For all their angry rhetoric, the two superpowers have been extraordinarily careful to avoid any direct military confrontation.

Still, there is grave danger: if not of war tomorrow, then of a long period of angry immobility in superpower relations; of an escalating arms race bringing into U.S. and Soviet arsenals weapons ever more expensive and difficult to control; of rising tension that might make every world trouble spot a potential flash point for the clash both sides fear. The deterioration of U.S.-Soviet relations to that frozen impasse overshadowed all other events of 1983. In shaping plans for the future, every statesman in the world and very nearly every private citizen has to calculate what may come of the face-off between the countries whose leaders—one operating in full public view, the other as a mysterious presence hidden by illness—share the power to decide whether there will be any future at all. Those leaders, Presidents Ronald Wilson Reagan of the United States and Yuri Vladimirovich Andropov of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, are *TIME*'s Men of the Year.

Certainly there were other momentous developments, and other protagonists and antagonists, on the world stage in 1983. In the U.S., it was a year of movement—dynamic, puzzling or both—in the economy and politics. Production and in-

*Marshal Ogarkov confirmed that the show had been screened privately for some Soviet officials. His view of it: "The danger which is shown in the film really exists."

Early-morning view from White House Rose Garden of Reagan alone in the Oval Office

"The only morality they recognize is what will further their cause, meaning they reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat..."

RONALD REAGAN
January 29, 1981

alarm. "The second cold war has begun," shrilled the Italian weekly *Panorama*. French President François Mitterrand warned that the situation was comparable in gravity with the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 or the Berlin blockade of 1948-49. American Sovietologist Seweryn Bialer, who has just returned from Moscow, where he had extensive interviews with Soviet officials, observes that "a test is coming between the superpowers. The Soviets are frustrated, angry. They have to reassert their manhood, to regain the influence in the international arena that today only America enjoys."

And always, growing in intensity throughout the year, came the horrifying pictures of the apocalypse that war in the nuclear age would mean. Astronomer Carl Sagan and Biologist Paul Ehrlich warned a sober scientific conclave in Washington that the detonation of less than half the megatons in U.S. and Soviet arsenals could send up a cloud of smoke and dust that would block out the sun's light, producing a "nuclear winter" of





Photograph for TIME by David Hume Kennerly



MEN OF THE YEAR

come rose and unemployment fell, all more rapidly than almost any economists or business leaders had dared to hope at the end of the frightening 1981-82 recession. The inflation rate dropped lower than it had been since 1972. Federal Judge Harold Greene supervised the final breakup of the world's largest corporation, A T & T.

Eight Democrats hit the hustings for their party's 1984 presidential nomination. Vice President Walter Mondale had built an imposing lead over Space Hero John Glenn in the race to take on Reagan, who set Jan. 29 as the date for an announcement that will stun the world only if it is *not* an official declaration of his candidacy for re-election.

Overseas, a familiar and often scowling face was removed from the ranks of world leaders. Menachem Begin, worn by illness and disheartened by the death of his wife, resigned as Prime Minister of Israel and was succeeded by his Foreign Minister, Yitzhak Shamir. Other leaders consolidated their power. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl led their conservative parties to huge electoral victories, Thatcher's Tories triumphing by the biggest British landslide since 1945. Pope John Paul II made moving pilgrimages to war-torn Central America and to Poland, where crowds of a million turned out daily to receive the native-born Pontiff's blessings.

Revolutionary terrorism and religious fanaticism shed more blood in the Third World, and this time some of the blood was American. U.S. troops went into combat for the first time since 1975, invading the tiny Caribbean island of Grenada and overturning a clique of hard-line Marxists who had murdered Prime Minister Maurice Bishop, a milder Marxist. Suicide truck bombers, presumably Islamic Shiite zealots who share Iranian Ayatullah Ruhollah Khomeini's belief that the U.S. is "the Great Satan," blew up the American embassies in Lebanon and Kuwait, as well as the headquarters of the U.S. Marine peace-keeping force at the Beirut airport, a shocking attack that killed 241 U.S. servicemen.

But the U.S.-Soviet rivalry colored, when it did not dominate, nearly all these seemingly disconnected events. Thatcher and Kohl defeated opponents who had made the acceptance of American missile emplacements a major issue. In the U.S., Democrats are decrying what they view as Reagan's excessively hard-line policy toward the Soviets. Even the Pope's travels were overshadowed by new, although inconclusive, evidence that Mehmet Ali Agca, the Turkish terrorist who shot the

Pope in 1981, had been aided by the Bulgarian secret service, presumably backed by the Soviet KGB—which was at the time headed by Andropov.

Violence in the Caribbean Basin and the Middle East brought the superpower confrontation into still sharper focus. The invasion of Grenada, Reagan claimed, prevented Marxists from turning that island into a Soviet-Cuban colony. Elsewhere in the region, however, no such quick or decisive victory for Administration policy seemed in sight. U.S. aid to the conservative government of El Salvador in its fight against a leftist insurrection, and to the *contra* rebels battling the

"Even if someone had any illusions about the possible evolution for the better in the policy of the present U.S. Administration, the latest developments have finally dispelled them."

YURI ANDROPOV
September 28, 1983

Marxist-led government of Nicaragua, did little more than sustain grim guerrilla wars. Just as the U.S. did after the 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the imposition of martial law in Poland in 1981, the Soviet Union volubly denounced the U.S. moves but did not so much as hint at military action in retaliation. This underlined a rule of U.S.-Soviet competition that neither side will ever acknowledge publicly: each has a sphere of interest that the other respects.

In the deadly quagmire of the Middle East, the spheres did collide. The bombing of the U.S. Marines apparently was carried out by terrorists striking from portions of Lebanon occupied by Soviet-armed Syria. Unable to bring about a Syrian withdrawal by diplomatic pressure, the U.S. at year's end was trying to forge a closer alliance with Israel. In December, a U.S. naval armada off Lebanon sent carrier-based planes to strike Syrian anti-aircraft batteries that had fired on an American reconnaissance flight; two planes were shot down, the first fighter-bombers lost to enemy fire since the U.S. stopped raids

Andropov, right, greets visiting U.S. Senators in his last public appearance, on Aug. 18

MEN OF THE YEAR

in Viet Nam. That raised the chilling prospect of U.S. air strikes' killing some of the almost 6,000 Soviet technicians who are manning Syrian ground-to-air missile sites. But both superpowers are sharply aware of the peril and are conducting quiet ambassadorial exchanges on how to avoid such consequences.

Thus almost anywhere one might try to unravel the tangled events of 1983, the skein leads quickly to two figures: Reagan and Andropov. Fittingly so. As Chiefs of State of the prime nuclear powers, they symbolize some of the stark differences in U.S. and Soviet values and political systems that make the Washington-Moscow competition so intractable.

To say that they are a study in contrasts is to put it most mildly. The two leaders are of comparable age. Reagan will turn 73 in February; Andropov will be 70 in June. Apart from having their fingers on the nuclear button, they share one other similarity: Reagan has never been inside the Communist world and Andropov has never been outside it. Otherwise, they differ in almost every way.

Reagan is the Great Communicator, a genial performer before audiences of one

sort or another since college days, master of the one-line quip, a man who entered politics in early middle age after winning fame in that all-American institution Hollywood. He rose to the presidency largely because he was able to articulate a personal ideological view on television more forcefully than anyone else. Andropov is the consummate Communist Party operative, a nearly faceless toiler in the political establishment of the U.S.S.R. all his adult life, head for 15 years of that quintessentially Soviet organization the KGB, a man who attained power by sophisticated backstage maneuvering in the ingrown, secretive Politburo.

In office, Reagan has become as vivid a figure to millions around the world as he has long been to U.S. citizens, dominating TV screens not only domestically but at times internationally. Andropov has become very nearly a ghost. He has been ill for much of his single year as Party Secretary and has been absent from public view since Aug. 18. He is suffering from a kidney ailment and is rumored variously to have diabetes and pneumonia. Though diplomats believe that Andropov has visit-

ed his office several times recently and is working daily at home or in a hospital bed, he has for months presented himself to the world only as a signature affixed to statements issued in his name.

There is a compelling reason for him to reappear at key meetings of the Party Central Committee and the Supreme Soviet this week: his continued absence would signal physical weakness that could have substantial political consequences, including Politburo discussions as to whether he is strong enough to stay on the job. On the other hand, if the truth is that Andropov is simply continuing to recover from a debilitating illness, his failure to appear would have far less meaning. Few things underline the difference between the U.S. and Soviet political systems so strikingly as the contrast between the regular, detailed medical bulletins the White House issued after Reagan was hit by a would-be assassin's bullet in March 1981 and the current statements by Kremlin officials to an unbelieving world that Andropov's ailment is nothing more than "a severe cold."

Personal contact between the two Presidents has so far been limited to mes-

1983: A CHRONOLOGY

APR 11 A presidential commission headed by Brent Scowcroft calls for the MX to be based in existing Minuteman silos.

APR 2 Gromyko rejects Reagan's proposal.

MAR 30 Reagan offers an "interim solution" to reduce the number of medium-range missiles in Europe.

MAR 23 In his Star Wars address, Reagan calls for long-term development of a system that would be capable of destroying Soviet missiles in space.

MAR 8 In a speech to Protestant evangelicals, Reagan characterizes the Soviet Union as "an evil empire."

JAN 31 Reagan offers to meet Andropov if an agreement can be signed banning all intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe. Andropov declines.

MAR 6 West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl's center-right coalition wins elections.

APR 27 Andropov calls for a ban on weapons in outer space.

MAY 3 Andropov offers to cut the number of SS-20s aimed at Western Europe.

MAY 28-30 Meeting in Williamsburg, the leaders of seven industrialized nations express support for NATO policy.

MAY 24-25 Congress approves \$625 million in funds for research and development of the MX missile.

JUN 9 British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's Conservative Party is re-elected with the largest majority since 1945.

JAN

FEB

MAR

APR

MAY

JUN



sages that TIME has learned they exchanged in 1983 (how many, no one will say). They are unlikely to lay eyes on each other soon, or perhaps ever. Even if Andropov's health would permit a summit meeting in the coming months, the political climate probably will not.

For Americans, Andropov is still a puzzle, and not only because of the mystery surrounding his health. When he speaks on Soviet-American relations, it is as the voice of an entrenched Kremlin bureaucracy. His personal opinions of the U.S., and indeed whether he has any that are distinguishable from the general view in Moscow, can only be conjectured. The Soviets emphatically do not have that problem with Reagan. The President's beliefs about the U.S.S.R., its leaders and their philosophy are in no doubt.

Reagan began forming those views shortly after World War II. When he left military service and resumed his civilian acting career, he was a liberal Democrat on domestic issues: he had never thought much about world affairs. The decisive experience for him was the Hollywood labor wars of the late 1940s. As a board member of the Screen Actors Guild, Reagan tried without success to help mediate a bitter jurisdictional dispute between SAG

and the Conference of Studio Unions. He became convinced that the dispute had been fomented by Communists who were trying to take over the U.S. movie industry on Moscow's direct orders. After he had led nonstriking actors across picket lines, Reagan received a threatening phone call. Thinking his life was in danger from Communists, he took to carrying a gun to ward off attackers. More than 30 years later, he still talks about that period with a passion that he believes Moscow reciprocates. Asked on the eve of his election how he thought he was viewed by the Soviet leaders, Reagan responded, "You see, they remember back, I guess, [to] those union days when we had a domestic Communist problem. I was very definitely on the wrong side for them."

As the cold war began and Reagan became a spokesman for General Electric after his movie career fizzled, he also underwent a conversion to conservatism; his views became definitely anti-Soviet as well as anti-Communist. He came to see the Kremlin's leaders as thugs and bullies who tried ceaselessly to stir up trouble around the world. During the 1980 campaign, he said there would be no "hot spots" if it were not

for the Soviets; they would back down if, and only if, they were confronted with force.

Since becoming President, Reagan has kept up the rhetoric, modulating it only slightly. As wielder of a nuclear arsenal and head of an alliance whose members often worry about how the U.S. might use its awesome power, he has spoken frequently of the necessity of trying to negotiate agreements with the Soviets. But his private distrust and animosity keep breaking through into his public utterances. In his first news conference as President, he said of the Kremlin leaders that, following stated Marxist doctrine, "the only morality they recognize is what will further their cause, meaning they reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat." In a sermon-like address to evangelical Christians in Orlando, Fla., early in 1983, he called the Soviets "the focus of evil in the modern world" and the prime example of "sin and evil" that "we are enjoined by Scripture and the Lord Jesus to oppose . . . with all our might."

At times, too, Reagan has talked of the Soviet Union as a phenomenon that a resolute West could cause to disappear. In a 1982 speech to the British Parliament, he borrowed a phrase that the Bolsheviks had

JUL 8 Turkish gunman Mehmet Ali Agca accuses the Bulgarian secret service and the KGB of being behind his attack on the Pope.

SEPT 5 Reagan denounces the Soviets for the KAL "massacre."

SEPT 1 The Soviets shoot down Korean Air Lines Flight 007, killing 269 aboard.

AUG 25 The U.S. and U.S.S.R. sign a five-year grain agreement.

AUG 18 Andropov is last seen in public when he meets with a delegation of U.S. Senators.

SEPT 17 Gromyko refuses to come to the U.N. after Aeroflot is denied permission to land.

OCT 25 U.S. and Caribbean forces invade Grenada.

OCT 22-23 Mass rallies are held in Western Europe to protest the deployment of U.S. missiles.

SEPT 28

A harsh statement attacking the U.S. is issued under Andropov's name.

NOV 14 The first cruise missiles arrive in Britain.

NOV 22 The West German parliament votes to accept new Pershing II missiles. Next day, the Soviets walk out of the Geneva INF talks.

DEC 8
The Soviets suspend START negotiations.

DEC 15
The Soviets suspend Vienna talks on conventional arms

JUL

AUG

SEPT

OCT

NOV

DEC



WHILE SOME CAN IT TO THE NE STATISTICS SHOW MAKE IT TO THE

Today people are trying to hold on to their cars longer than ever.

And while statistics show the average life expectancy of today's cars is eleven years, that figure pales in comparison to the life expectancy of today's Volvo.

Because statistics show the average

life expectancy of a Volvo is over sixteen years.*

Which could mean over sixteen years of comfortable driving in seats equipped with adjustable lumbar supports that relieve tension and road fatigue.

Years of effortlessly maneuvering through

*Based upon an actuarial analysis of 1985-1987 U.S. Registration Data conducted by Ken Warwick & Associates, Inc. Due to many factors including maintenance, driving conditions and habits, your Volvo



RS MIGHT MAKE EXT DECADE, W VOLVOS COULD NEXT CENTURY.

parking lots due to power assisted rack and pinion steering that cuts one of the smallest turning circles of any car.

Years of clean air made possible by a Fresh Air Ventilation System that exhausts stale air from the passenger compartment, and helps prevent odors and fumes from

may not last as long. Then again, it may last longer. Summary available at your Volvo dealer. © 1983 Volvo of America Corporation.

ever getting inside. If all this sounds like a sensible way to transport yourself to the next century, buy a Volvo.

Who knows?

By the year 2000 we may have a car that'll get you through that century, as well. **VOLVO** A car you can believe in.



used against their opponents and predicted that Soviet Marxism would wind up on "the ash heap of history." Speaking at a Notre Dame commencement in 1981, and again to evangelicals last March, he called Marxism-Leninism a "bizarre chapter in human history whose last pages are even now being written."

Moreover, Reagan's closest aides say he consistently speaks exactly this way in private. At one National Security Council meeting in September 1982, Reagan advised Negotiator Nitze on a way to present an American position in the Geneva INF talks that both men knew the U.S.S.R. would find unacceptable. Said he: "Well, Paul, you just tell the Soviets that you're working for one tough son of a bitch."

The Soviets initially did not believe that Reagan meant what he said. In 1980 they actually seemed to welcome his election. They had by then become fervent members of the Anybody-but-Jimmy-Carter Club, voicing criticisms that might have been taken from Reagan's campaign speeches: Carter was so vacillating and unpredictable that no one ever knew what he might do. Moscow at that point viewed Reagan as a standard Republican conservative whose more strident anti-Soviet proclamations were just campaign oratory. The Soviets recalled that Richard Nixon had won political prominence by talking stern anti-Communism, but in the White House turned into the prime American architect of U.S.-Soviet détente.

Shortly after Reagan took office, though, the Soviets concluded that they had been wrong about him. Americans often remark that Reagan's bark has been worse than his bite. After all, he lifted the embargo that Carter had clamped on U.S. grain sales to the Soviet Union following the invasion of Afghanistan and proposed only mild and ineffectual economic sanctions in response to the imposition of martial law in Poland. But the Soviets have come to take Reagan at his word. Says a Kremlin specialist on American affairs: "With Carter, it was always interesting to read a speech and say, 'Aha, [former Secretary of State Cyrus] Vance wrote this one' or 'Here's a paragraph from [Carter's National Security Adviser Zbigniew] Brzezinski.' But we have done what you might call content analysis of Reagan's statements over the past couple of years, and we feel quite sure that the man speaking was Reagan." To Soviet ears, the President seems not only to be denying the U.S.S.R.'s coveted claim to equal status with the U.S. as a superpower, but even challenging its right to exist as a legitimate state.

In particular, Reagan's \$1.6 trillion military buildup has shocked the Soviets.

"The march of freedom and democracy . . . will leave Marxism-Leninism on the ash heap of history."

RONALD REAGAN
June 8, 1982

"Nuclear war is being planned by the apostles of the arms race . . . with the cold-blooded composure of gravediggers."

ANDREI GROMYKO
October 1, 1982

To Americans, that reaction might seem sheer hypocrisy. Nothing did more to destroy détente than the Kremlin's insistence throughout the 1970s on piling up weapons far in excess of any legitimate Soviet defensive needs. During the decade the U.S.S.R. put in place thousands of nuclear missiles and expanded its oceangoing war fleet while increasing its already massive superiority over the NATO countries in tanks and artillery. Any U.S. President elected in 1980 would have had to continue and enlarge the counterbuildup that Carter had already begun.


The cloistered nature of the top Kremlin leadership singularly handicaps its members in judging how their actions look to non-Soviet eyes. To them, Reagan's plans appear to envisage a restoration of the nuclear su-

periority the U.S. enjoyed during the 1950s and '60s. His arms-control proposals seem to be designed only to placate European public opinion while codifying that supremacy. Georgi Arbatov, one of Moscow's chief experts on U.S. affairs, charges that "the Reagan Administration returned to Geneva not to find an agreement but to relieve the pressure [from the peace movement] and, frankly, to fool the people." As to Reagan's rhetoric, Anatoli Dobrynin, Soviet Ambassador to the U.S., says: "Words are deeds."

Andropov has put much less of a personal stamp on foreign policy, and on the minds of his adversaries, than Reagan. Not only was he a somewhat unknown figure to those outside the Kremlin even before illness removed him from public view, but some of what the West thought it knew about him was wrong. The picture of Andropov as a Westernized intellectual, fond of American music and books, that circulated widely in the months before he assumed power following the death of Leonid Brezhnev in November 1982 was mostly the product of wishful thinking, possibly aided by deliberate Kremlin disinformation. He does, however, have a reputation as the best-informed and most sophisticated Soviet leader since Lenin. Western diplomats who visited him in Moscow early in his tenure were impressed by his command of facts and sardonic humor. But French Foreign Minister Claude Cheysson, who met Andropov last February, found him "extraordinarily devoid of the passion and human warmth" that Russians often display.

Andropov amassed the trappings of power more rapidly than any previous Soviet leader; he assumed the twin posts of General Secretary of the Communist Party and President of the U.S.S.R. within seven months. By that time, he had also become chairman of the powerful Defense Council. It took Brezhnev 13 years to accumulate those three titles. Once again, though, appearances may have been deceiving. It is still not clear how much real authority Andropov exercised before he fell ill, nor how much he will regain if he recovers full health. The task of determining that is complicated by the nature of Moscow's decision-making system.

At the top, in theory at least, sits the Politburo, which meets every Friday morning in the Kremlin. It is one of the most elderly ruling bodies in the world; the average age of its eleven full members is 67. Most started moving into influential positions during the 1940s and, like Reagan, formed their views then. They have traveled in the West only fleetingly if at all. Some Soviets acknowledge the problem that their leaders' age and narrow-



PLAYERS GO PLACES

Low Tar Players.

Regular and Menthol
Kings and 100's

Kings: 12 mg "tar," 1.0 mg nicotine—100's: 14 mg "tar,"
1.1 mg nicotine av. per cigarette, by FTC method.

Warning: The Surgeon General Has Determined
That Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Your Health.





INCIDENTALLY, THERE ARE ALSO A FEW PRACTICAL REASONS TO OWN ONE.

A lot of people buy cars because they like the way they look.

We're not against that.

But we do think it would be a shame if people bought the new Cougar only for its beautiful lines.

Because an extraordinary amount of

advanced design and engineering has gone into Cougar's styling.

Its aerodynamic shape, for example, is as practical as it is beautiful, able not only to slip cleanly through onrushing air, but to use that air to help the car hug the road.

Get it together—buckle up.



Its EEC-IV electronic engine control system is the most advanced in the world, and is capable of controlling six different functions at once to keep the engine operating at peak levels of both power and fuel efficiency.*

Even the Cougar's shock absorbers are specially designed with pressurized nitrogen to respond to jarring road obstructions consistently better than conventional shocks.

And while most cars in its class have not undergone significant styling changes in several years, this Cougar was newly and aero-

dynamically shaped for 1983.

Obviously, we're pleased if you are attracted to Cougar's looks.

But after a careful consideration of its many practical features, we hope you won't let its looks blind you to its real beauty.

Call us toll-free at 1-800-MERCIFAX for a copy of our 1984 Cougar catalog.

*27 EST. HWY. $\frac{23}{23}$ EPA EST. MPG. Compare to the estimated MPG of other cars. Your mileage may differ depending on speed, weather and trip length. Actual highway mileage less.

MERCURY. A MORE ENLIGHTENED APPROACH.

LINCOLN-MERCURY DIVISION



MERCURY COUGAR

IMPORTED

BY VAN MUNCHING & CO., INC.
NEW YORK, N.Y.
SERVE AT 45°-50° F.

AND BOTTLED IN HOLLAND

HEINEKEN LAGER BEER

HORS CONCOURS MEMBRE D'JURY HONORABLE
TRADE MARK
GRAND PRIX PARIS 1889

Heineken

DIPLOME D'HONNEUR
AMSTERDAM 1883



MADE IN HOLLAND
TRADE MARK



**"Come to think of it,
I'll have a Heineken."**

ness of experience creates. Confides one young journalist: "The old leaders at the top who cling to their old ideas and to their power, that is our tragedy."


On the matters that most affect the outside world, Andropov is widely believed to make decisions only after consulting the two other members of what is in effect a troika. They are Andrei Gromyko, 74, who has been Foreign Minister since 1957, and Dmitri Ustinov, 75, the Defense Minister who appears to have backed Andropov in his bid for power after Brezhnev's death. Ustinov's rising prominence suggests that the Soviet Union under Andropov is becoming still more militarized. Brezhnev took his country far in that direction, but Andropov appears to be even closer to the Soviet military than his predecessor.

The military's clout reflects in part the ancient obsession with security of oft-invaded Russia and in part a cold judgment by the Politburo that armed might commands both the fear and respect that give the modern Soviet Union its best chance of extending its ideological and political influence. The practical effect is that the marshals and admirals get whatever weapons they want, never mind the cost.

Andropov's contributions to the breakdown of Soviet-American relations, in one sense, go back further than Reagan's. He became a full member of the Politburo in 1973, when Reagan was still Governor of California with no influence on U.S. foreign policy. Thus Andropov was part of the Kremlin leadership that did much to scuttle détente not long after it was launched.

Détente was an attempt to spin a web of agreements on arms control, trade and scientific and cultural exchanges that would give both sides a tangible stake in maintaining correct, if not exactly friendly, relations. Nixon and Brezhnev formalized the concept in 1972 by signing an agreement pledging each side not to seek a "unilateral advantage at the expense of the other." The Soviets have long accused the U.S. of violating the spirit of détente by encouraging Egypt to switch from Kremlin client to U.S. ally—for which there is no evidence—and by enacting the Jackson-Vanik amendment of 1974, which made a U.S.-Soviet trade agreement contingent on freer emigration of Jews from the U.S.S.R. Moscow regarded that as unwarranted interference in its internal affairs.

Soviet violations of détente, however, were so much more blatant as to appear systematic. In the analysis of Adam Ulam, head of Harvard's Russian Research Center, the Kremlin leaders always took it for granted that the two sides would continue their competition for power and influence in the Third World, and after the Watergate scandal broke they saw little reason to be cautious about doing so. They judged the political authority of Nixon and his successors to be



Pershing II missile being test-launched

No longer metaphorical but physical.

too gravely weakened for them to shape any vigorous response to Soviet probes. Among other things, the Kremlin sent guns and Cuban troops to help Marxist movements seize power in Angola, Ethiopia and South Yemen.

Most destructive of all, Moscow continued its relentless piling up of arms. In 1977 the Kremlin started emplacing mobile, accurate, triple-warhead SS-20 nuclear missiles in the Far East and in the western U.S.S.R.; those in Europe vastly increased the destructive power aimed at U.S. NATO allies. The SS-20s were supposedly intended to counter the threat posed to Moscow by British and French nuclear weapons, but by the end of 1978 they already exceeded the British and French forces in the number of warheads.

In retrospect, it seems incredible that the Politburo thought it could pursue such a course while still proclaiming, as Brezh-

nev often put it, that "détente is irreversible." Yet for a long time, it seemed that the Soviets really could make major gains at the West's expense, as U.S. and West European leaders struggled to preserve what remained of détente. As late as 1979 Jimmy Carter was publicly embracing Brezhnev in Vienna to celebrate the signing of the SALT II treaty, which set limits on the number of nuclear launchers that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. could build. Then came the invasion of Afghanistan. In the Soviets' eyes, they only prevented the overthrow of a Communist regime on their borders. To the West and especially the U.S., the invasion was a supremely menacing use of Soviet troops, for the first time since World War II, to expand the Soviet empire by force.

Suddenly, it was all too much. Though the Soviets had nothing to do with it, the nearly simultaneous seizure of hostages by Iranian revolutionaries added to an impression among tens of millions of American voters that the U.S. was letting itself be humiliated around the world, and that it was time to fight back. By the end of his presidency, Carter had reluctantly given up trying to persuade the Senate to ratify the SALT II treaty, reversed his earlier policy of holding down military spending, embargoed grain sales to the U.S.S.R. and called for a boycott of the Moscow Olympics. The voters saw it all as too little and too late. Other factors, of course, influenced the election of 1980, notably rampant inflation and unemployment. Still, the popular appeal that carried Reagan to decisive victory was enhanced not a little by the fact that he had proclaimed an uncompromisingly hard-nosed anti-Soviet line long and loud.

For all his tough talk, Reagan initially gave low priority to foreign affairs. He preferred to concentrate on his economic program. Equally important, he felt he needed to get a military buildup in high gear so that he could later negotiate with the Soviets from a position of strength. Nonetheless, the President was soon faced with an urgent issue. In 1979, the NATO countries had approved what came to be known as the two-track decision. The U.S. would install Pershing II missiles in West Germany and cruise missiles in five European countries, beginning at the end of 1983, to counter the menace of the Soviet SS-20s. Simultaneously, Washington would try through negotiation to limit or even eliminate the deployment of all such intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe. At the same time, fears of nuclear war, fanned in part by incautious remarks from members of his Administration and Reagan himself, dictated a new attempt to negotiate reductions also in "strategic" weapons, the intercontinental missiles that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. aim at each other.

Reagan, according to his closest aides, believes fervently in reducing nuclear arms. Nonetheless he has held to his be-

lief that the U.S. must first remove what he felt had become a frightening Soviet superiority in some categories of atomic weaponry. As a goal for the INF talks that began in Geneva in late 1981, he embraced the "zero option": the dismantling of all Soviet SS-20s in Europe and Asia in return for no deployment of the new U.S. medium-range missiles. In the separate Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) that got going in June 1982, Reagan proposed a one-third cut in nuclear warheads. The trims, however, were structured in such a manner that the Soviets would have had to destroy a disproportionate share of their heavy land-based missiles that the U.S. most fears.

The Soviets, as expected, said no to the two proposals, but they sent signals to the Reagan Administration that they wanted a *peredshka* (breathing space). They had good reason: on many fronts, Soviet policy was and remains troubled. Though Moscow's military may command fear and respect, the appeal of Soviet ideology and life-style is at an alltime low, even among the Kremlin's allies. The open though unarmed rebellion in Poland during 1980-81, followed by the imposition of martial law, demonstrated that the U.S.S.R. can hold its East European allies in line only by force.

At home, the growth rate of the inefficient Soviet economy has slowed to roughly less than half its 1960s pace. Some experts believe the economy might stop growing altogether or even decline later in the 1980s. Most important, by 1982, with Brezhnev terminally ill, the Kremlin was burdened by internal maneuvering for the succession.

When Andropov succeeded Brezhnev, the deadline for the installation of U.S. missiles in Western Europe was approaching rapidly. The Kremlin had already begun a diplomatic and propaganda campaign to stop the deployment by trying to turn European public opinion against it. Andropov raised that effort to a fever pitch. Says one Soviet observer: "I have never seen such sustained propaganda over one issue."

The campaign was an adroit, though ultimately unsuccessful mixture of blandishments and threats. Andropov enticed Hans-Jochen Vogel, head of West Germany's opposition Social Democratic Party, who visited Moscow in January, with visions of the benefits that Bonn would enjoy if only it rejected the U.S. missiles: lucrative trade, reunification of families separated by the division of Germany, regional disarmament. At the same time, the Kremlin played deftly on Western Europe's fear of nuclear war. It warned incessantly that

"Soviet-sponsored guerrillas and terrorists are at work in Central and South America, in Africa, the Middle East, in the Caribbean and in Europe, violating human rights and unnerving the world with violence."

RONALD REAGAN
June 17, 1982

"In Viet Nam, morality as understood by leaders in Washington was brought home with napalm and toxic agents; in Lebanon it is being hammered in by salvos of naval guns; in El Salvador this morality is being imposed by genocide."

YURI ANDROPOV
September 28, 1983

deployment would end the INF talks, and possibly the START negotiations as well. Worse, the Soviets said that in self-defense they would take measures that would increase the risk of nuclear catastrophe.

To the U.S., however, Moscow was simultaneously dropping hints that Andropov, like Reagan, really wanted to focus his energies on domestic economic problems. Reagan in January sent Andropov what aides describe as a "very personal message" stressing that the U.S. did not seek confrontation. By midsummer, the two sides seemed to be groping cautiously toward an easing of tensions. Washington and Moscow signed a long-term grain deal and were negotiating an agreement on the opening of new consulates. Some of Reagan's aides were even entertaining thoughts of a summit meeting with Andropov in 1984. Says a senior Reagan lieutenant:

"We had undertaken to pave the way for a summit when the KAL thing shot it right in the posterior."

The shooting down of Korean Air Lines Flight 007 provoked a rage against the U.S.S.R. that surpassed even the anger stirred by events in Afghanistan and Poland. In a TV address, Reagan in effect all but indicted the Soviets as cold-blooded killers unfit for membership in the community of civilized nations. Yet, according to an investigation by the International Civil Aviation Organization, the Soviets may not have known on the fateful morning of Sept. 1 that the plane they were destroying was a civilian jetliner. Though the Soviets tracked KAL 007 for 2½ hours, their fighter planes did not fire on it until it was about to leave their airspace. It is quite plausible that the Soviet military, acting without consulting Andropov, decided to shoot down an "intruder" before it got away, without making sure what it was. If so, Reagan would have had a fully provable, and only slightly less damning, case had he charged the Soviets with the equivalent of criminally negligent manslaughter rather than premeditated murder.

The Soviets immediately made matters worse for themselves by refusing to apologize. They indicated they would commit the same act in similar circumstances, and accused Reagan of causing the deaths of KAL 007's passengers by sending the plane on a spy mission. Says Michael Howard, Regius professor of modern history at Oxford University: "The incident was a nasty indicator of the inability of the U.S. and the Soviet Union to talk to each other intelligently about what was on the balance of probabilities a horrible mistake."

By then, too, the Politburo had other reasons to be on the defensive. The West German and British elections, and the inability of the European peace movement to mount demonstrations quite so large or angry as anticipated, meant that Moscow's strident campaign to stop deployment of the Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe had failed.

The Kremlin summed up its accumulated frustration and resentment in a carefully crafted statement issued on Sept. 28 in Andropov's name. It accused Reagan of mouthing "obscurities alternating with hypocritical preaching" and, in so many words, said that it could no longer do business with him. America-Watcher Arbatov hammered the same point home in an interview with TIME. Said he: "We have come to the conclusion that nothing will come from dealing with Reagan."

Two months after the Andropov statement, the U.S. missiles started going into Britain, Italy and West Germany. The Soviets reacted by announcing that

they would begin to take their oft-threatened countermeasures, installing new ballistic missiles in Czechoslovakia and East Germany and intermediate-range warheads on submarines plying the waters just off U.S. shores.

Meanwhile, vilification reached new heights, or depths. After the shutdown of KAL 007, American indignation boiled furiously; one video-game operator reprogrammed his devices to show as the target "Andropov, Communist mutant from outer space." The Soviets have more than reciprocated, and on a quasi-official level. The controlled Soviet press abounds in descriptions of Reagan as a crypto-Nazi. Soviet cartoonists, who have long depicted the President as a gunslinging cowboy, now add swastikas or ghostly faces of Hitler to their drawings.

Unsettling though all this is, it does not necessarily increase the danger of war. New missiles in Eastern Europe and on submarines will not significantly increase Soviet firepower aimed at Western Europe or the U.S. Nor are the American missiles in Europe the first-strike weapons that Kremlin propaganda incessantly proclaims them to be.

Despite the comparisons between the current impasse and the crises over Berlin and Cuba, there is an all-important difference. In 1948, Soviet soldiers stood ready to shoot if the U.S. tried to supply West Berlin by land rather than air; in 1962, U.S. ships were poised to stop and search Soviet vessels carrying arms to Cuba. Nowhere in the world today, however, are American and Soviet forces pointing guns at each other.

That could happen in the Middle East, but even there the most recent violence has provoked nothing comparable to the worldwide alert ordered by Richard Nixon during the 1973 Arab-Israeli war, in the heyday of détente. The lesson being drawn by many diplomats and academic experts is that the very power of modern weapons is deterring not just nuclear but conventional war.

Even the talk of a new cold war seems overstated. When a Soviet diplomat voiced his fears to an acquaintance at the State Department over a meal in Washington, the American coolly replied: "You're probably too young to remember what the cold war was really like. If this were another cold war, you and I would not be sitting here having lunch." During the real cold war, Stalin sealed off the U.S.S.R. and its citizens from virtually any contact with foreigners. Today, despite the frost in formal relations, U.S. and Soviet journalists, athletes, scientists, performing artists and even diplomats continue to meet and chat unofficially. Just last week the Soviets agreed to coop-

erate with American, European and Japanese scientists in tracking Halley's comet over the next three years.

The Reagan Administration, indeed, is remarkably cocky about U.S.-Soviet relations. In its view, the U.S. military buildup—and Reagan's policy of firmness generally—has the Soviets on the run. Says one official: "For a couple of decades the Soviets were sure that the economic and political balance, part of what they like to call 'the correlation of forces,' was shifting their way. But the past few years the balance has been going the other way, and they have begun to realize that. They have lost ground in the Middle East compared with a few years ago. Their politics aren't selling in the Third World any more. Afghanistan is a problem for them. Their economy still suffers from terrible rigidity, and their foreign policy is in con-

dition that it can get a better bargain from a President who is running for re-election than from one who has been returned to office for another four years.

That, at least, is the theory. But it is also true that some of Reagan's advisers made the mistake of thinking that the Soviets would not walk out of the INF talks in the first place. Some officials take seriously the possibility that the Soviets will not return to the bargaining table at all. Even if they do, the continuing chill in superpower relations poses at least three serious dangers:


1) An escalating arms race. The new generations of nuclear weapons, such as mobile intercontinental missiles and long-range cruise missiles, that are being readied by both sides share several characteristics. They are expensive. They are extremely difficult to detect and thus to include under the verification procedures of any arms-control agreement. They will compel each side to take countermeasures, perpetuating a never-ending cycle.

Existing arms-control treaties could start to break down. The SALT I interim agreement on offensive arms, signed in 1972, technically has expired, and SALT II was never ratified by the U.S. Senate. Washington and Moscow, nonetheless, have agreed to observe the major provisions of both treaties. The Administration, however, is preparing a report that accuses the U.S.S.R. of cheating on some important provisions of the SALT treaties.

Reagan may send this report to Congress in January. It will mention that the Soviets are operating a large radar base in Siberia that the U.S. suspects will be used to guide the kind of antiballistic missiles that have been banned under the SALT I-ABM treaty and will question Moscow's compliance with important parts of SALT II as well. Yet the Soviets would have a point in asking what right the U.S. has to complain about violations of SALT II, a treaty it has refused to ratify. If the arms-control agreements start to erode, all restraints on the nuclear race would be off, and the piling up of weapons would increase the peril of war by accident.

2) New strains in the Western alliance. Though the U.S. has won the first round of the Euro-missile controversy, the battle is far from over. Full deployment of Pershing IIs and cruise missiles will take five years, during which Moscow will keep up its propaganda, seeking to appeal to the people of Western Europe over the heads of their governments.

The campaign has had an effect. Though it was then-Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany who originally called attention to the imbalance being caused by Soviet SS-20 missiles aimed at



Marshal Ogarkov assails U.S. arms-control proposals at a news conference
His view of The Day After: "The danger which is shown really exists."

fusion." A colleague draws this conclusion: "We don't think we can or should fall all over ourselves to be nice to them."

The President's aides are convinced that the Soviets will return to the arms-control bargaining tables, and that the U.S. will be able to talk them into a deal. Says National Security Adviser Robert McFarlane: "If we can engender a kind of dialogue with the Soviets in which we make clear that this renewed sense of purpose, strength and resolve is not oriented against their system, and that we are not seeking to alter it, then this dialogue can lead to a stable *modus vivendi*. We seek that." Privately, some Administration officials predict that the Soviets will resume the Geneva INF talks by March. Their reasoning: now that the U.S. missile deployment has started, it is in the Soviets' military self-interest to keep the deployment as small as possible, and to do that they will have to agree to begin talking again. In addition, sooner or later, and probably sooner, Moscow will conclude

Western Europe, his Social Democratic Party has since changed its position and come out against the NATO response. In Britain, the Labor Party advocates unilateral nuclear disarmament. The crushing electoral defeats that these principal opposition parties suffered in 1983 dim their hopes of coming to power very soon, but Washington can no longer be serenely confident that any foreseeable British or West German government will back its position. Even the strongest West European governments must take into account the public nervousness. If the Soviets engage in a prolonged boycott of the arms talks, some NATO allies may start pressing the U.S. to make concessions.

3) Proxy wars. Careful as they have been to avoid a military clash, the superpowers run a constant risk of being dragged into one by the action of allies or clients they cannot control. One example: if the incessant factional strife in Lebanon broadens into a general Middle East war, Syria could call on Moscow to intervene militarily under a 1980 treaty. The ambassadorial exchanges between Washington and Moscow on avoiding a clash would have a greater chance of success if diplomatic contacts between the two capitals were more frequent and less antagonistic.

The current prospects for damping down these dangers seem bleak. Some of the more obvious steps have been officially rejected, or even sneered at, by one side or the other. Nonetheless, there are moves the U.S. could undertake, without violating any of Reagan's ideological convictions, to make the superpower relationship less menacing and more manageable. Among them:

► Offer to merge the START and INF talks. For the moment, the White House has decided against doing so, in the belief that the Soviets will soon resume the INF talks on Reagan's terms, namely by accepting deployment of some new U.S. missiles in Western Europe. Moscow scoffs at the idea of a merger for precisely the opposite reason. "One can only merge something that really exists," says First Deputy Foreign Minister Georgi Korniyenko.

Nonetheless, the idea has merit. The distinction between "strategic" missiles, defined by the U.S. as those with ranges of 3,400 miles or more, and "intermediate-range" weapons has always been arbitrary. Westerners remark that Soviet strategic missiles can hit London or Rome as easily as Chicago; Moscow considers any missiles capable of striking the U.S.S.R. to be strategic, whatever their range. Merging the two sets of talks would make possible more varied trade-offs between different types of weaponry.

In any merged talks, the Soviets are

"The Korean airline massacre [was a] crime against humanity."

RONALD REAGAN
September 5, 1983

"The borders of the Soviet Union are sacred. No matter who resorts to provocations of that kind, he should know that he will bear the full brunt of responsibility for it."

ANDREI GROMYKO
September 7, 1983

likely to demand concessions for withdrawing the missiles they are now installing in East Germany and Czechoslovakia. As long as intermediate-range missiles were under discussion, the U.S. would be burdened by the necessity of representing the position of its European allies, supposing those often disunited nations could agree on one. But the alternative could be a prolonged suspension of the START as well as the INF negotiations, a breakdown of what remains of the SALT treaties, a completely unrestrained arms race, and considerable damage to NATO.

► Propose measures to guard against war by accident. Reagan has suggested some, including upgrading the White House-Kremlin hot line and more comprehensive advance notification by each side to the other of missile test launches and major military maneuvers. Senators Sam

Nunn, a Georgia Democrat, and John Warner, a Virginia Republican, advocate setting up "crisis control centers" manned by military officers of each country who could get in touch with one another immediately. Democratic Presidential Candidate Gary Hart offers a variation: a single center in Geneva or Vienna staffed jointly by the Pentagon and Soviet Defense Ministry, where each side could see pictures of what the other's satellites were showing and explain any activity that looked threatening.

At present, the political climate is so strained that the Kremlin derides even these modest "confidence-building measures." Says Arbatov: "What difference could it make if your President were to call Moscow [on the hot line] and say, 'Hi, it's Ronnie, a couple of missiles are flying in your direction but don't take it seriously?'" Still, war by accident or miscalculation is a terrible risk for both sides, and the risks become greater as missile flight times become shorter. The Soviets are already dropping hints that they may adopt a "launch on warning" strategy. This means that they would automatically fire their missiles as soon as they picked up signals that U.S. missiles were on their way. The U.S., also fearing sneak attack, may be driven toward the same strategy. Confidence-building measures might help dissuade both from adopting that idea, which is supremely dangerous because it means a wayward blip on a radar screen could touch off a holocaust.

► Seek regular and frequent contacts with Soviet officials at every level. Though the old Nixon-Brezhnev idea of annual summits seems unrealizable for a long time to come, Washington could promote more frequent exchanges at the foreign minister, ambassador and assistant secretary levels, supplemented perhaps by meetings of uniformed military men. The belief has grown among U.S. conservatives that merely agreeing to talk is itself a concession. But no American interest is likely to be compromised if Secretary of State George Shultz and Gromyko, say, were to agree to meet several times a year. Each side needs to hear what the other is really thinking—fully, frankly, in private, in person and often. In the absence of frequent contact, both sides will be doomed to keep practicing what former British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington has christened "megaphone diplomacy." Says former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger: "Our weakened ability to communicate with the Soviets adds modestly, though measurably, to the risk of a clash of arms and detracts markedly from the cohesion of the alliance."

► Adopt a realistic trade policy. Though Reagan has learned not to say so out loud, associates say he still believes that the U.S.S.R. could be badly damaged, and

forced to cut back on its military buildup, if the West cut it off from trade contacts. That is a delusion: inefficient as the Soviet civilian economy is, the Kremlin could squeeze it further to continue piling up arms. The Soviet public will do what it is told, partly because it has no choice, but partly because it responds vigorously when it believes the motherland is being threatened. Sporadic U.S. attempts to invoke sanctions against the U.S.S.R., notably Washington's fumbling efforts to block the building of a pipeline to carry Soviet natural gas from Siberia to Western Europe, have embittered U.S. relations with NATO allies, costing Washington more than it could hope to have gained in damage to the Soviet economy.

Thus the U.S. should renounce, and let it be known that it is renouncing, the idea that trade sanctions can prod the Soviets into changing course, and should shift to a policy of straightforward self-interest. It should trade with Moscow when that offers mutual advantage, as in the case of the grain deal. Simultaneously, though, it should maintain tight controls on the export of high technology that the U.S.S.R. can turn to military use, an effort in which the Europeans have begun to cooperate. Such a policy would not in itself do much to promote better U.S.-Soviet relations, but it would deprive the Kremlin of a wedge that it has proved all too skillful at driving between the U.S. and its allies.

► Improve relations with China. In dealing with Peking, Reagan initially let his anti-Communism get in the way of his anti-Sovietism. He spoke during the campaign of establishing "official" relations with Taiwan and, as President, sold enough arms to that island to chill relations with the Chinese. Andropov, in contrast, has continued negotiations to paper over the split between the two Communist giants, though Soviet-Chinese hostility and suspicion have kept them from getting very far.

Reagan has now agreed to exchange visits in 1984 with Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang. Such efforts should be continued and intensified. The strategic importance to the U.S. of China, which keeps a quarter of all Soviet military forces tied down guarding a 4,200-mile frontier, is obvious. Moreover, Soviet foreign policy gives a high priority to heading off anything resembling a U.S.-Chinese alliance. Historians have long suspected that Nixon's 1971 opening to China helped prod Brezhnev into signing the agreements with the U.S. that launched détente the next year.

► Build up conventional forces more rapidly, and encourage European allies to do the same. At present, NATO may not have enough troops, tanks, artillery pieces and tactical aircraft to fight the forces of the U.S.S.R. and its Warsaw Pact allies to a draw on the ground. As a result, NATO strategy contemplates the possibility of

using tactical atomic weapons from the first day of a Soviet invasion of Western Europe. That has handed Moscow a two-pronged propaganda advantage. The Kremlin has made a pledge never to use nuclear weapons first. The U.S. has felt unable to match this pledge because it would "make Europe safe for conventional aggression" by superior Soviet ground forces. At the same time, Moscow stirs terror by warning incessantly that the firing of any atomic weapon of any size at Soviet troops would trigger an all-out Soviet nuclear attack in response.



Propaganda, however, is the least of it. NATO would reduce the real risk of nuclear war if it built the conventional forces that could defeat Soviet aggression without resort to atomic weaponry. But Western Europe has been reluctant to make the major financial sacrifices that would be required. However, the U.S. is in no condition to preach. A serious attempt to defend Western Europe without atomic weapons would probably require reviving the draft, and many U.S. politicians from Reagan on down refuse to consider that idea.

The preliminary to any attempt to thaw relations between the superpowers is to tone down the rhetoric. By year's end Washington showed signs of realizing that it had carried the war of words too far. Reagan did not denounce the Soviets for suspending the arms-control talks, contenting himself with expressions of regret and of hope that Moscow will reconsider. In an interview with TIME, he went so far as to say that he would not make his "focus of evil" statement again (see following story).

But there is some doubt that the Soviets will take any change in rhetoric at face value. According to Sovietologist Bialer, the U.S.S.R.'s distrust of Reagan is now so

high that Moscow would probably reject even the most reasonable U.S. arms-control proposals. The Kremlin is convinced that Reagan is trying to nullify the Soviet Union's most important achievement of the past 20 years: having attained equal status as a superpower. Because of their weakening economy, uncertain leadership and failure to stop the U.S. missile deployment in Europe, says Bialer, "there is no doubt the Soviets are in a hole. But anyone who thinks that will make them easier to deal with does not understand them."

For hundreds of millions of people in every part of the globe—including the U.S. and the Soviet Union—it is not enough just to make the superpower conflict less menacing. They long for a breakthrough toward cooperation, rather than controlled animosity, and toward a level of disarmament that would leave the superpowers incapable of ending civilization. Alas, those can be only the most remote of long-range goals. The values of U.S. and Soviet society are too starkly contrasting to permit for the foreseeable future anything friendlier than a more cautious competition. It is in the U.S. interest to be strong militarily, but Washington should explore every possibility of negotiating agreements that would reduce the risk of war. The Soviets, for their part, will be more secure when they begin to understand how their own actions can, and do, provoke the kind of U.S. response that they later deplore.

There is a chance of moving away from confrontation, even under the leaders who brought the U.S. and the Soviet Union so close to it during

1983. Reagan has time and again proved to friends and political opponents alike that they have underestimated his ability to calculate how far his intense ideological convictions can realistically be pushed. Andropov, in the judgment of Richard Nixon, could be "the most formidable and dangerous adversary" of any recent Soviet leader, but also "the best one with whom the U.S. could develop a live-and-let-live relationship." Says Nixon: "He is not, like Khrushchev, controlled by his emotions. He is more imaginative than Brezhnev. He is highly intelligent. He is coldly pragmatic. He will not do something rash."

Both leaders must realize the overriding truth of superpower relations: since they cannot make war without destroying themselves and most of the rest of the world, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are, in Henry Kissinger's phrase, "doomed to co-exist." To TIME's Men of the Year, the point can be put more personally: whatever else they do, Reagan and Andropov will be judged by history primarily on how each deals with the other's country—and with the other as a man. —By George J. Church.

Reported by Erik Amfitheatrof/Moscow, Laurence L. Barrett and Strobe Talbot/Washington, with other bureaus

An Interview with President Reagan

"There is less of a danger today than there was a few years ago"


The morning's bulletin from Vienna reported another chill of silence in the diminishing dialogue between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Negotiations on reducing conventional forces had gone into recess with the Warsaw Pact nations refusing to set a date for resumption of the talks. But that afternoon in the Oval Office Ronald Reagan's mood was sanguine, his bearing confident, as he discussed Soviet-American relations with three visitors from TIME: Editor in Chief Henry Grunwald, Managing Editor Ray Cave and White House Correspondent Laurence I. Barrett. The President was pleased to concentrate on that subject, he said with a smile, because "there are a great many misperceptions out there about the situation now. As a matter of fact, if you correct the misperceptions, you'll have an exclusive scoop." Highlights of the interview:

Q. After three years of experience with the Soviets, have you encountered anything that was different from your expectations?

A. No, I came here determined to attempt to bring about a reduction in arms, an end to the arms race. Well, it really hadn't been an arms race. There had only been a buildup on one side. I also wanted to see if we couldn't get the world on a practical road to peace. And I am still dedicated to that. I think that, contrary to some of the cries of despair out there, the world situation is better than it was when we came here.

There is one new development that I have worried about for some time. That is the extent, lately, to which military leaders in the Soviet Union are, apparently without any coaching or being briefed by the civilian part of government—at least there is no evidence of that—taking it upon themselves to make statements, and rather bellicose statements. There has not, in the past, been evidence of top military leaders going public with attacks on the U.S. and seeming to enunciate policy on their own. We have to be aware of this and pay a little attention to this, to see if they have become a power on their own.

Q. Have you formed any image in your own mind of your counterparts over there? Does it help to try to think of them as human beings with strengths and failings?



A. Really, you deal with them as human beings. But you are aware that, certainly, they are ideologues dedicated to the philosophy that brought them into power. As a matter of fact, we have had some reports from people in other countries that Soviet leaders seem to feel that they can communicate better with us because we are more consistent.

Q. Better than with Jimmy Carter?

A. Well, I won't use any other names. But previously they didn't know, really, what the policy of America was and what we were doing. This has been related to us, as I say, by third parties. At least they know where we stand.

Q. It has been suggested, on the basis of a statement issued in Mr. Andropov's name, that they have given up on you, decided they cannot deal with you.

A. Maybe they are thinking of getting involved in an American election as they did in Germany. I would hope, with the same lack of success.

Q. But you do not feel it has become impossible to do business with them?

A. No, I do not, because they have to look realistically at the alternative. It was summed up in a cartoon that I love to cite, when Brezhnev was portrayed as saying to a Soviet general, "I liked the arms race

better when we were the only ones in it." They have to know that we are not going back to our window of vulnerability that existed before we did our military refurbishing. They have to know that whatever they do is going to dictate our course in that regard. And they also have to know that industrially they cannot compete.

Q. Can you tell us anything about your correspondence with Andropov?

A. We have channels open. This, again, is part of the misperception out there—that, somehow, we are incommunicado, we are not speaking to each other. We have been in communication with them, and intend to continue. [Reagan at this point recalled his first letter to Brezhnev, written in April 1981, while convalescing from the assassination attempt.] I wrote that letter to Brezhnev in longhand, and it was sent to him in longhand. I said to him that I have long believed that his people and our people wanted the same things: that those people out there on the street, in their homes, want to raise their families in peace. They want to educate their children. I said that only governments seem to cause wars; wars do not come from people. Now, whether he read that letter or not, I don't know, and will never have any way of knowing. After quite a long delay, the answer that came to me was not handwritten, nor was it personal. It was the usual rhetoric that is publicly exchanged between our two countries.

Q. Would you send the same kind of letter to Mr. Andropov?

A. We have tried to get this kind of correspondence, but it has been difficult. I understand the situation with the new regime coming in after the death of Brezhnev.

Q. But you do not feel such a letter would be appropriate at this time?

A. I feel a little hard put because of the lack of information and knowledge that we have about where he stands. It isn't like dealing with Brezhnev after years in the Kremlin. You knew where he was and felt you knew how to reach him. But we do have contacts, we can get our views there and solicit theirs. We have discussed

specific issues between our two countries and have had some results from them.

Q. When you say "where he stands," you mean in the Soviet hierarchy?

A. Yes, in the hierarchy.

Q. In other words, you are not absolutely sure that he has yet totally taken control?

A. I had a few months' advance warning to get a government organized, so I know what some of those problems are.

Q. You have based your nuclear negotiating strategy on the conviction that once Moscow was persuaded that deployment of the Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe would go ahead, the Soviets would then bargain seriously. Now those conditions have been met. Yet the Soviets are not negotiating seriously. How do you propose to deal with that?

A. Isn't it possible that they had embarked on a kind of negotiating procedure that did not result in negotiating directly with us but was trying to bring some weakening of the NATO alliance in order to prevent the deployment of the intermediate-range weapons that NATO had asked us for in 1979? Now, I offered what I think was a very reasonable and common-sense proposal: the one way to prevent the deployment was if they would destroy their weapons and we'd have zero-zero, no intermediate-range weapons in the European theater.

This they rejected out of hand, and so I said, "All right. If they are unwilling to go that far, then we will make a proposal for a reduction to fair and equal amounts on both sides and let them come in and negotiate. What is a number that they would be agreeable to?" And, so far, they have still kept to their program: "No, we must stop the [NATO] deployment." In other words, they bought our zero-zero proposal—50% of it. Zero for us. And they had over 1,000 warheads already targeted on Western Europe.

Now they have left the negotiations. I have to believe that once those missiles of ours are put in place and they see that we have the will to go forward with this—that they have not been able to separate the alliance—then, I think, they will return to the table. And we are waiting for any proposals that they want to make.

Q. So you believe the original negotiating strategy is still sound?

A. Yes.

Q. You think it will lead to a reasonable deal—when? In the next year or so?

A. I don't know what the time period will be. But I do know this: when we came here—you asked about surprises—we were all surprised. We thought we knew something during the campaign of the situation, but we were still surprised to find how desperate the U.S. position was mili-

tarly. But we have been very successful in what we have done. And I think this is what brought the Soviets to the table in the first place. For the first time in years they have seen that the American people have the will to provide a deterrent force.

Q. In dealing with the Soviets, have you found the European allies a help or a hindrance?

A. They have been very much a help. This is evident in the INF deployment. They

"I would like to convince the Soviets that no one in the world has aggressive intentions toward them. Certainly we don't."

have held up under all this propaganda, all these demonstrations. The alliance is stronger and better than it has ever been.

Q. When you made the remark containing the phrase "focus of evil," which certainly nettled the Soviets, did you feel that it was appropriate? Would you make it again?

A. No, I would not say things like that again, even after some of the things that have been done recently.

Q. Is that because they now know your thinking on that and so it is a case of "message delivered," or because you think it was a mistake that only got their paranoia up?

A. They really had to know and understand how we felt, what our views were and why we thought it necessary to build up our military defenses. In addition to their aggressive policy of wanting to spread their doctrine throughout the world, there is a great fear on their part that they must be constantly on guard and defensive. This was characteristic of Russia before it was Communist, a suspicion of neighbors. Maybe it goes back to Napoleon's march on Moscow, maybe it goes back to other things of that kind.

I would like to convince the Soviets that no one in the world has aggressive intentions toward them. Certainly we don't. And we have proof over 50 years that we don't. Did we do anything when we were

the only power with nuclear weapons? Did we threaten the world? Did we say to everyone, "Lay down your arms"?

Now I would like to make them see that it is to their best interest to join us in reducing arms. What more of an international superpower they could be if it was not just in the military that they were superior, but if they could join the family of nations as trading partners, working together, as all of us are, for the improvement of their own people's standard of living. I don't know whether that is possible for them to see, but I think it is worth a try.

Q. Speaking of their joining the "family of nations," do you think they have any useful role to play jointly with us in the Middle East?

A. Well, right now they are in the Middle East in one place, and that is where there is trouble. That has been a tactic of theirs: they do not necessarily start the trouble, but they get in and stir the pot. They could be helpful if they would use their influence to persuade Syria to withdraw from Lebanon and let the Lebanese regain control of their country.

Q. You have said that a summit meeting needs an agenda, and that it should not be embarked upon unless a result is visible. But as concerns continue to rise about the strain between the U.S. and the Soviets, is there any form of summitry that could be less formalized?

A. I have never thought of it so much as being formalized. But when one of these things takes place, we know from the past, the hopes of people worldwide are brought to a high level. And then if there is nothing accomplished except that you have had a meeting, and neither one of you has anything to say when you leave that meeting, there is a letdown. The letdown, the disappointment—I just don't think that is healthy or good. But you mentioned all the "strain." I have to say that I think there is less of a risk and less of a danger today than there was a few years ago. I think that the world is safer and further removed from a possible war than it was several years ago.

Q. Would you tell us why?

A. Because there was more risk of someone gambling if it did not look as if we could retaliate in any extremely damaging way. I think the Soviets now understand that we have the will power to preserve a deterrent, so there is logic in our talking. If both of us would say, "Hey, we have heard the scientists talk about how the world itself could be destroyed. As long as we maintain things so that neither side is able to start a war with the other, why don't we reduce our arsenals?" And if we start down that road of reducing, for heaven's sake, why don't we rid the world of these weapons? Why do we keep them? Here's a world today whose principal armaments would wipe out civilians in the tens and hundreds of millions. Let's get back to being civilized. ■

Some Practical and Realistic Advice

Eight statesmen, American and foreign, suggest how to reduce tensions

What, concretely, can the U.S. and the Soviet Union do to lower the level of tension between them in the months ahead? How, in the longer run, can they manage their competitive relationship better so as to reduce the risk of armed confrontation? TIME asked eight statesmen, both in and out of office, to offer some practical recommendations.

CLAUDE CHEYSSON
French Foreign Minister



Enormous ideological and moral differences are at the root of the difficulties in relations with the Soviet Union. Nothing will make these differences disappear in the foreseeable future. However, we should aim to develop three types of relations: exchanges and contacts that benefit both sides, arms negotiations, and a high-level dialogue that will enable the participants to explain their intentions and so avoid misunderstandings.

Let us not over dramatize the crisis. It is serious, but it has not undone everything. Trade and all kinds of contacts have not been broken off. The Soviets value these as do the European countries and the U.S. in the sectors that interest them. We must maintain and reinforce these exchanges, exercising caution, but without seeking to use them as instruments of political pressure.

The thread of negotiations must not be broken. The START negotiations must stay alive. In Stockholm, a conference is to open on conventional disarmament in Europe, which has great political importance. There is no justification for the Soviet Union's walking out of the INF negotiations. We would view a return to the negotiations not as a defeat for the U.S.S.R. but as a reasonable exercise of responsibility by its leaders.

High-level dialogue between leaders of the U.S.S.R. and those of the West, in particular the U.S., is badly needed at this time. Such dialogue is indispensable if we are to prevent misunderstandings over areas of tension leading to dangerous confrontations. Mistrust and suspicion have bred a vicious cycle that has to be stopped. Let us try to break out of it by making the most of all the good will that exists and of every initiative. France will not be last in this. What we can do, we will do without ever losing sight of the fact that overtures to dialogue must not be confused with weakness.

In the long run, lasting peace has to be based on recognition of the differences between the Soviet system and the system of countries that want to live in peace on the basis of equal rights and responsibilities. This presupposes that the West will not speak a crusading language and that the Soviets will cease to found their policy on the certainty of the collapse of the other system.

It further presupposes their willingness to take into account the right of others to security instead of being content to assert their own, and that they modify their methods in places where the evolution of society and men's aspirations so require, as in Poland. With our historical links to Eastern Europe and sensitivity to the unjust division of our continent, we Europeans hope that the Soviet Union will gradually find a way to accept self-determination and observance of basic human rights in the area it controls.

RICHARD NIXON
Former President of the U.S. (1969-74)

There are those who believe that just acting tough and keeping the Soviets guessing is the best way to keep them restrained. That is a very dangerous attitude, and I speak as a hawk. I want the military balance restored. And I want an arms-control agreement that denies both sides a first-strike capability. The leaders of the Soviet Union and the U.S. must work out a process, rules of engagement, to prevent their mutual destruction.

The Soviet leaders may be wrong. They may be evil, and they certainly think we are evil, but they are rational. They are not like Hitler. They are concerned that the differences between the U.S. and them may explode into war. They want to win, but they want to win without war.



The first thing we need to do now, on the various arms-control fronts, is nothing. There would be no greater mistake than for the U.S. and the Europeans to say, "My God, we've done something wrong, and we have to make some concessions to get them back to the table." That would be negotiating under duress and would encourage walkouts in the future. In the longer term, I think they will come back because it is in their interest to do so.

We do need, however, to leapfrog the sterile arms-control debate and broaden the dialogue and the agenda to include other factors. We have to explore the possibilities of some initiatives in other areas that might attract their interest.

On the economic front, our current trade is too small to make it an effective weapon. But with the Japanese and the

European shares added, it is large. I thought it was a mistake to give up on the grain embargo without getting something in return. But economic leverage must be used subtly and firmly.

On Third World problems, we share with the Soviets the desire of not wanting to leave our fate in the hands of others. The proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries may be the most important new problem of the next 20 years. The Soviets have as much interest as we do in seeing that controlled. They do not want that danger any more than we do.

It is important to go forward with our military research in space, but this will be destabilizing unless we offer to share that information with the Soviet Union. As a gesture of good faith, and as a demonstration that we are not trying to build a shield that will let us win a nuclear war, we should offer our discoveries to the Soviet Union.

All this argues that there needs to be a relationship between the Soviet Union and the U.S. at the highest level, a relationship of hardheaded détente. Since the Secretary of State or the National Security Adviser are too busy, I think a special person should be named by the President to focus entirely on the relationship with the Soviet Union. The Soviets should have a similar person. Then there could be summitry without the leaders themselves.

Finally, it is vitally important that these two men, Reagan and Andropov, meet. I don't want them to meet just to shake hands, but they can meet to agree on a process whereby more negotiations will take place on arms control and other matters. But because it is the right thing, my instincts tell me it will happen.

BOB HAWKE
Prime Minister of Australia

We should not allow ourselves to be overwhelmed by a sense of global pessimism or imminent disaster. Australia does not accept that the nuclear-weapons states alone have the right to determine these issues. Their calculations—or miscalculations—could have terrible consequences for all of us. We do not consider that unilateral disarmament would be an effective way of bringing about an end to the arms race. What is required is realistic, concrete and balanced proposals that have at their heart a recognition of

the national security interests involved.

The Australian government has greatly elevated arms control and disarmament goals within our foreign policy. As a member of every multilateral disarmament body, Australia is promoting the negotiation of treaties to end nuclear testing and to ban chemical weapons, and measures to prevent an arms race in outer space. We are also helping to strengthen measures against the spread of nuclear weapons. For countries such as ours, there is no substitute for the hard slog of multilateral negotiations designed to engage the interests and support of the superpowers. We were recently encouraged by a U.N. vote in which this year the U.S. changed its vote, thereby bringing us closer to negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The withdrawal of the U.S.S.R. from the INF talks of course worries us. The Soviet position on this seems to me to overlook the fact that their deployment of SS-20s threatened the balance of power in Europe in the first place. I urge Mr. Andropov to think again on this. In the longer term, I believe that both superpowers have compelling reasons of acute national interest to pursue arms-control agreements. Progress will probably be achieved in gradual steps and only after difficult negotiations.

I would stress that adequate and effective provision for verification is the crucial precondition for progress. Australia wants to make a constructive and realistic contribution within our means. In this connection, the joint U.S.-Australian facilities on our soil play an important role in arms-control verification as well as maintaining Western security. We are upgrading our capacity to monitor nuclear explosions by seismic means.

On the assumption that the more lurid public accounts of disarray in the Soviet leadership are not true, I would like to see a properly prepared summit between Presidents Reagan and Andropov next year. As well as putting arms control back on track, I would be looking for some sign of greater understanding between them on the Middle East in particular. Frankly, the convergence of superpower rivalry and indigenous instability there at the moment worries me more than the arms race itself.

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI

National Security Adviser (1977-81)

The U.S.-Soviet relationship is today quite normal, and this is all to the good. Unlike the past, when American public opinion tended to swing from euphoria about détente to hysteria about the cold war, the public correctly perceives Soviet-American relations as basically antagonistic and competitive, though linked by a common interest in survival.

We should have no illusions, however,

that the antagonism will quickly wane. Our histories, geographies, politics and global interests are so varied that for a long time to come we will remain rivals. Regional conflicts in the Middle East and Central America will continue to fuel that global rivalry. Accordingly, we should



concentrate on what can be done to minimize the chances of a direct collision. Three initiatives would help:

1. Instead of seeking a comprehensive and complex START treaty, with all its negotiating and verification pitfalls, we should settle for a limited, interim agreement. For the time being, I would forgo the more ambitious Reagan proposals for across-the-board reductions, including major cuts in throw-weight and warheads. Instead, I would accept the most recent Soviet counterproposal for a mutual scale-down to 1,800 launchers, but with an added joint limit of, say, 7,500 warheads. Such a simple interim agreement would break the logjam, be easier to verify, provide the basis for a wider treaty later, and we could have it by next summer.

2. Initiate genuinely consultative annual U.S.-Soviet summits. I first proposed this back in 1977, and the idea has been endorsed recently by both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Mondale. Our leaders should simply get together once a year for three or so days of truly informal talks so that we gain gradually better understanding of our differences, but without expecting unattainable accommodations. Greater mutual sensitivity to our conflicting positions would in itself help to keep the competition more stable.

3. Widen the annual economic summit with our principal allies into a strategic-economic summit, so that we can review together more systematically how best to handle the East-West relationship, thus minimizing the differences among ourselves, which the Soviets are always tempted to exploit.

In brief, in order to avoid a head-on collision we have to collaborate with our political enemy even while competing assertively.

RICHARD VON WEIZSÄCKER

Mayor of West Berlin and sole candidate for election as President of West Germany

We must concentrate our efforts on conducting a positive policy vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, today more than ever. This means on the one hand that we must not tempt Moscow into regarding our defense capacity as something we are prepared to compromise. Thirty-eight years of experience have taught Berliners better than anyone else that the protection of our freedom rests above all on the American commitment. For this help and engagement, we are deeply grateful.

But a decisive point is that we use our freedom to achieve good relations with

the Soviet Union, rather than confrontation. East-West relations today are preoccupied with disarmament, rearmament or arms control. Experience teaches that it is not disarmament that points the way to peace, but rather that peaceful relations open the door to disarmament. States arm themselves against one another when there are poor relations between them, when they have no common interests or when these are not developed, when cooperation is rejected or not even attempted. But where concrete fields of cooperation are exploited or created, arms problems present a smaller obstacle to peace. Neither rearmament nor disarmament, neither confrontation nor peace movements, neither hawks nor doves bring about peace. Peace is the consequence of practical cooperation.



The Helsinki accords divide East-West relations into three categories: security, cooperation and the free movement of people. Wisely, it was agreed that all three categories should be regarded only in context and as being of

equal value. Security matters, taken on their own, offer too little chance of success. The same applies to an isolated policy concerning the free movement of people. Cooperation is of paramount importance. If we succeed in extending, step by step, cooperation in the fields of science, food, ecology, transportation, economics, energy and development policy, then arms control and even free movement of people will ultimately come into the range of what is possible. However, if we refuse to cooperate with the Soviets in these fields, in which they have always lagged behind, and if we instead demand concessions in the only area in which they are equal or superior to the West, namely in armaments, we shall have to wait a long time for security, human rights and a secure peace. Our goal is a policy that combines strong defense and cooperation with the Soviet Union.

FRANCIS PYM

Former British Foreign Secretary (1982-83)

My first recommendation is to stop shouting. A period of relative silence would be healthy.

My second is to begin a process that will lead to increased dialogue. After recent years, that would take time anyway: Andropov's illness means the Soviet Union has a leadership problem in the immediate future. That has to be understood and may cause delay.

My third is for us in the West to be ready for the time when the Soviets return to the negotiating table, which in my judgment is likely to happen by the summer months, and be prepared, if that were helpful, to continue medium-range missile talks in a different arms-control format, possibly through the START talks.

In the meantime, NATO should mount

MEN OF THE YEAR

a major drive in all 16 member countries, with the total support of each government, designed to explain and explain again to our electorates the strategy of deterrence and its effectiveness in influencing the Soviet Union not to attack us.



Confidence must be restored in the minds of our peoples. Nuclear weapons induce fear. Of course, so does some rhetoric. When confidence is restored and calmness returns, there will be a better environment for dialogue.

More attention must be given to European-American relations. Misunderstandings abound. To many Europeans, Reagan looks like a warmonger. To many Americans, Europeans seem unaware of the Communist threat from the Soviet Union and contribute too little to NATO. The causes of such misreadings are clear, but we cannot afford them.

We must coordinate more closely our perceptions and handling of regional disputes. The very interdependence of our world means that the interests of the West may be as directly threatened by events outside the NATO area as inside it, and I feel it may be time we reviewed our crisis-management mechanisms. Each component of the alliance, while accepting that agreement will not always be possible, should at least ensure that the others know the course of action it intends to pursue and try to evolve joint reactions.

The Soviet Union has enormous problems: economic, political and social. It will not solve them by continuing the political doctrine that created them. Let us understand, therefore, the nightmare that faces the Russian leaders and leave them alone to sort themselves out.

DEAN RUSK

Secretary of State in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations (1961-69)

The U.S. and the Soviet Union share a massive common interest—the prevention of an all-out nuclear war. We are the only two nations that, if locked in deadly combat, could raise a serious question as to whether this planet can any longer sustain the human race. It follows that Washington and Moscow bear a heavy and special responsibility toward the peace of the world and the survival of the human race. That should be the beginning of any consideration in both capitals of our mutual relations.

The rhetorical level between Washington and Moscow has reached unusual levels of acrimony. Both capitals should take care because there is a self-hypnotic effect in rhetoric that could cause one or both to begin to believe their own excessive vituperation and lead to dangers that we ought to try to avoid. We now have put behind us more than 38 years since a nuclear weapon has been fired in anger, de-

spite many serious crises we have had since 1945. The Soviets have no more interest in the destruction of Mother Russia than have we in the destruction of our beloved America. Both sides must avoid the game of "chicken"—pressing to see how far one or the other can go without crossing that lethal threshold.

An urgent and immediate problem is to find some way to put a limit to what is becoming an insane race in nuclear weapons. Such negotiations cannot be easy, but the effort has to be made. Both in the Soviet Union and in the U.S. the influence of military thinking seems to be in the ascendancy, if for different reasons. Both capitals must find a way to put a brake on the demands of their respective military establishments for the commitment of increasingly massive resources for military purposes.

An immediate problem that needs the most serious attention is the prospect that we shall be moving the arms race into outer space. Without getting into the scientific and technical debate as to whether antiballistic missile capabilities are possible through such esoteric space weapons, two things should be clear. First, we must assume that the Soviets will be able to do whatever we manage to do, after spending hundreds of billions of dollars in the effort. Secondly, we can be sure that if we or the Soviets, or both, begin to approach success in devising such space weapons, there will be a frantic race on both sides to devise offensive missiles that can penetrate or evade such defenses. The prospect



is, therefore, that we shall be spending hundreds of billions of dollars, perhaps trillions, with no perceptible underlying change in the strategic relations between the two countries. Before we pollute the wondrous heavens with the folly of man, surely we should put our heads together to try to find some way to avoid this dismal prospect. As common members of Homo sapiens, perhaps we can also find a way to put our heads together to address some of the urgent problems to be faced in the coming decades by the entire human race in such fields as energy, the environment, the population explosion and world hunger. Little by little such common necessities may lay a restraining hand upon the forces that would move us toward violent conflict.

PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU

Prime Minister of Canada

Following the commitment made by leaders of seven industrialized nations at the Williamsburg summit last May to devote our full political energy to the search for peace, I undertook a personal initiative to seek ways to improve East-West relations. When the two largest military powers each have over 20,000 nuclear

weapons, any one of which is many times more powerful than the bombs that devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, their relationship is of vital interest to all nations. I believe each individual leader must see the search for stability as a personal responsibility. It is far too important to be left to the superpowers alone.

Despite periods of fruitful negotiations, and despite some valuable treaties, both sides bristle with nuclear arms, the number and sophistication of which increase every year. In seeking to reduce world tensions it is not sufficient to deal with abstract equations and the relative capabilities of this weapon over that. What is at issue is not just the capacity of



these weapons for destruction, but the intentions of the governments that control them: the superpowers must each be convinced of the good intentions of the other.

I have met with NATO leaders in Europe, the Commonwealth

heads of government in New Delhi, as well as Japanese and Chinese leaders, and most recently with President Reagan in Washington. I shared with them my conviction that we cannot hope to see real progress in the negotiations for arms control and disarmament until there is an injection of high-level political energy into these negotiations and into the East-West relationship itself.

I am very encouraged by indications that the process has now begun. At their recent meeting in Brussels, NATO foreign ministers accepted the need for mutual respect for the legitimate security interests of both superpowers. They reiterated their belief in genuine détente and a relationship between East and West based on equilibrium, moderation and reciprocity; perhaps more important, they eschewed aspirations to military superiority. The Western agreement to send political leaders, rather than diplomats, to Stockholm in January and NATO's commitment to make a new political effort at the Vienna negotiations on conventional forces indicate a growing acceptance that political leaders must personally involve themselves in the peace process.

It is also heartening that President Reagan, in his recent speech in Japan, stated his belief that a nuclear war is not winnable and must never be fought, noted his desire to eliminate all nuclear weapons and stressed his willingness to compromise in order to achieve significant reductions in the level of armaments threatening mankind. These are positive indications that improvements in the relationship are possible.

I believe that the Soviet Union shares the desire for peace, and I hope we will soon see similarly positive signs from them that we might aspire, not just to a more stable balance of terror, but to a real and lasting peace. ■

ENGINEERED FOR TOTAL RESPONSE

PONTIAC 6000

"Total response" may be an engineering "buzz" word to many people, but every *driver* can appreciate what it means when test-driving the 1984 Pontiac 6000.

Total response *is* balanced performance, and it's the very essence of the new Pontiac 6000. In the Pontiac 6000, total response means controlled ride motions *without* harshness, while maintaining minimal lean in hard cornering. It means power rack and pinion steering for excellent road feel and quick response time in everything from parking maneuvers to sweeping mountain bends.

And it means an electronically fuel-injected engine that delivers genuine operating efficiency,* while providing enough punch to skillfully merge onto a freeway.

The totally responsive Pontiac 6000. One of the most distinctive and technically advanced front-wheel-drive cars built in America. Drive one today, and see for yourself what totally responsive *really* means.

*Pontiac 6000 offers an EPA EST MPG of 25 and a highway estimate of 39. Use estimated MPG for comparisons. Your mileage may differ depending on speed, distance, weather. Actual highway mileage lower. Some Pontiacs are equipped with engines produced by other GM divisions, subsidiaries or affiliated companies worldwide. See your Pontiac dealer for details.



PONTIAC  **WE BUILD EXCITEMENT**



Blockaded Berliners await a U.S. C-47 bringing food



Soviet tanks rumble into rebellious Budapest



Khrushchev at the U.N. in 1960



Nikita eats an Iowa hot dog with relish

MEN OF THE YEAR

The Vocabulary of Confrontation

Four decades of ups and downs, seen through a special lexicon

It is an adversary relationship unique in history and, appropriately, an entire new vocabulary has been created to describe it. Some of the words are little more than political science jargon; many have become household terms. Together, they offer a surprisingly complete record of the ups and downs that have marked U.S.-Soviet relations in the 38 years since the two countries emerged as superpowers. The main entries in the U.S.-Soviet lexicon:

Cold War: *neither war nor peace; a rivalry kept in check by fear of nuclear war.*

Memories of the exuberant meeting of Soviet and U.S. soldiers at the Elbe River in April 1945 faded rapidly from American minds as the U.S.S.R. moved to consolidate its control over the countries of Eastern Europe that had been liberated by the Red Army. Coined in 1946 by Herbert Bayard Swope, a journalist and sometime speechwriter for Philanthropist Bernard Baruch, the term cold war became synonymous with the tensions of the post-World War II era. During a speech at Westminster College in Fulton, Mo., in 1946, Winston Churchill provided another image for the new age. "From Stettin on the Baltic to Trieste on the Adriatic," he said, "an iron curtain has descended across the Continent."

The first major battle of the cold war was waged over an isolated Western outpost behind Churchill's curtain: Berlin. In June 1948, the Soviets blocked all water, road and rail links to the city in an effort to prevent the Allies from setting up a unified government in the Western-controlled zones of postwar Germany. For the next ten months, U.S. Air Force C-54 and C-47 cargo planes landed at West Berlin's Tempelhof Airport every three minutes, ferry-

ing as much as 12,940 tons a day of food and fuel into the besieged city. The Soviets finally capitulated, but by the end of 1949 the West had new cause for worry: the Soviets had exploded an atomic bomb, ending the U.S. nuclear monopoly.

Containment: *a policy aimed at checking the expansion of a hostile power or ideology by political, economic or military means.*


The swift Western response to the Berlin blockade reflected postwar thinking about how to manage the Soviets. Writing in *Foreign Affairs* under the pen name "X" in 1947, George Kennan, then head of the State Department's policy planning staff, argued that the West should "contain" the U.S.S.R. by countering Soviet pressure at crisis spots around the globe. But Kennan later denied paternity of any "containment" strategy. It was President Harry Truman who made it the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy. In requesting \$400 million in military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey, which were threatened by Communist expansion in 1947, he boldly affirmed the Truman Doctrine: the U.S. was prepared "to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." The Truman Administration also provided more than \$13 billion in economic assistance to the nations of war-shattered Western Europe through the Marshall Plan and established the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) one month before the Berlin blockade was lifted. Truman did not send Americans to China to prevent a Communist victory in 1949, but the following year he dispatched U.S. troops to block a Communist takeover of South Korea.

Brinkmanship: *a strategy in which a nation displays its willingness to risk war if an adversary does not back down.*

President Dwight D. Eisenhower took office in 1953 determined to be more aggressive in checking the spread of Communism. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles summed up this approach when he told *Life* magazine in 1956 that "if you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost." Still Eisenhower and Dulles backed away when Soviet tanks rumbled into Budapest later that year to crush the Hungarian uprising. Eisenhower contributed another idea when he invoked the domino theory in 1954 to justify U.S. economic aid to South Viet Nam. The notion that the fall of one nation to Communist control would send adjacent countries toppling like dominoes lined up in a row was used in the 1960s to explain U.S. military intervention in Viet Nam.

Peaceful Coexistence: *the idea that countries with conflicting ideologies can live together without waging war.*

Nikita Khrushchev and the collective leadership that emerged after Stalin's death in 1953 used the term peaceful coexistence to signal the Kremlin's interest in improving diplomatic contacts with the world. "Neither we nor the capitalist states want to make a trip to Mars, so we shall have to exist together on one planet," Khrushchev said during a visit to India in 1955. As he dismantled Stalin's apparatus of terror at home, the Soviets took their own word for the period from the title of a popular novel: *The Thaw*. The withdrawal of Soviet occupation forces (along with those of the Western allies) from Austria in 1955 seemed to belie the postwar axiom that Communists never give up any territory they hold. In an equally auspicious sign of improved East-West relations, Eisenhower traveled to a Geneva summit that year for the first face-to-face meeting between Soviet and American leaders since Tru-



U.S. destroyer eyeballs Soviet ship taking missiles from Cuba



Brezhnev and Nixon share confidences



Détente reaches all-time high in space

man had met Stalin at Potsdam in 1945. Portly and unpredictable, Khrushchev left an indelible imprint on the American consciousness when he blustered his way across the U.S. in 1959, hobnobbing with New York multimillionaires, Hollywood stars and Iowa farmers. But in May 1960, before Eisenhower could return the visit, the Soviets shot down an American U-2 spy plane flying about 65,000 ft. above their territory. Khrushchev demanded an apology from Eisenhower; a few months later, he showed his anger by pounding his shoe on his desk at the U.N. General Assembly.

Eyeball to Eyeball: a diplomatic crisis that threatens to escalate into war.

President John F. Kennedy had come to office criticizing Eisenhower's failure to check the advance of Communism in Cuba. But Kennedy's effort to roll back Soviet influence ended in disaster in April 1961 at the Bay of Pigs. It was there that 1,300 CIA-trained Cuban exiles failed to invade the island and spark a movement that would bring down Fidel Castro.

The West's commitment to Berlin was tested in August 1961, after the East Germans put up a wall to keep their people in. But the boldest Soviet bloc challenge came in the fall of 1962. Khrushchev gambled that he could shift the global balance of power by secretly building some 40 launch pads for medium-range missiles in Cuba. After U.S. surveillance planes spotted the new installations, Kennedy told the Soviets that a nuclear missile launched from Cuba against any nation in the Western Hemisphere would be considered "as an attack by the Soviet Union on the U.S." He ordered a naval quarantine of the island. After a tense 13-day confrontation, Khrushchev decided to withdraw the weapons. Said Secretary of State Dean Rusk: "Eyeball to eyeball, they blinked first."

Détente: the relaxation of tensions between nations.

The word was borrowed from the

French, but the West Germans ushered in the new age in East-West relations with their own version, *Ostpolitik* (literally, Eastern policy). Its architect, Chancellor Willy Brandt, made a historic visit to Moscow in 1970 and signed a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union. About this time, President Richard Nixon indicated to the Soviets that he would be willing to engage in negotiations aimed at limiting the U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals. With the help of Henry Kissinger, Nixon also played his "China card" and traveled to Peking, putting Moscow on notice that the U.S. was prepared to deal with a country that shared a tense, 4,200-mile-long border with the Soviet Union.

During the Moscow summit in 1972, Nixon and Soviet Leader Leonid Brezhnev signed the SALT I pact and in a joint communiqué pledged to refrain from "efforts to obtain unilateral advantage at the expense of the other, directly or indirectly." The high point of détente, in a literal sense, came in 1975, when Soviet and American spacemen linked up and shook hands 140 miles above the globe during a joint space mission. Meanwhile, troubles back on earth threatened to end the era of good feeling.

Linkage: a policy that ties progress on one front to developments in other areas.

In 1974 Congress attached the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Reform Act and said in effect that favorable trade concessions to the Soviet Union would be granted only if the Kremlin relaxed its restriction on Jewish emigration. Moscow balked. That year, President Gerald Ford flew to Vladivostok to pursue arms-limitations talks with Brezhnev. In 1975 the two leaders met again at the Helsinki summit of 35 nations to sign an agreement that recognized Europe's postwar boundaries and stressed the importance of increased human contacts between East and West. But the Soviets had stepped up their involvement in Angola and South Yemen, as they would later in Ethiopia, causing Americans to wonder if détente was a

one-way street. As the 1976 election campaign began to heat up, Ford declared: "I don't use the word détente any more." Instead he advocated "peace through strength."

President Jimmy Carter came to office committed to advancing human rights and wrote a letter to Nobel Peace-prizewinning Physicist Andrei Sakharov, a leading Soviet dissident. The Kremlin responded in anger, and less than two months later the Soviets also rejected the Administration's new ideas on arms control. Carter and Brezhnev eventually met in Vienna to sign a SALT II pact in June 1979. But as Carter struggled to get congressional approval for the treaty, the Soviets marched into neighboring Afghanistan in December 1979. Said Carter: "My opinion of the Russians has changed more drastically in the last week than even the previous 2½ years." After the invasion, Carter gave up attempts to ratify SALT II and called for an international boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympics. The President also slapped restrictions on high-technology transfers to the Soviet Union; his embargo on grain sales was lifted by President Reagan in April 1981.

Deadline: a stalemate characterized by a high level of frustration.


Coming to office on a conservative groundswell, President Ronald Reagan made no secret of his feelings about the Soviets. In a statement issued in September 1983, Soviet Leader Yuri Andropov railed against the "outrageous militarist psychosis" in the U.S. and accused the White House of resorting to "what almost amounts to obscenities alternating with hypocritical preaching about morals and humanism" in describing the Soviet Union. The Reagan Administration has spoken in terms that echo containment, brinkmanship, and eyeball to eyeball. Despite its abusive rhetoric, Moscow persists in claiming that it wants to uphold détente. The relationship may once again have changed, but the language of confrontation has not.

—By John Kohan

when I planned to retire before fifty

this is the business that made it possible

a true story by John B. Haikey



Starting with borrowed money Duraclean gave me the opportunity for financial security... In eight years I sold out at a profit and retired.

"Not until I was forty did I make up my mind that I was going to retire before ten years had passed. I knew I couldn't do it on a salary, no matter how good. I knew I couldn't do it working for others. It was perfectly obvious to me that I had to start a business of my own. But that posed a problem. What kind of business? Most of my money was tied up. Temporarily I was broke. But, when I found the business I wanted I was able to start it for a small amount of borrowed money.

"To pyramid this investment into retirement in less than ten years seems like magic, but in my opinion any man in good health who has the same ambition and drive that motivated me, could achieve such a goal. Let me give you a little history.

"I finished high school at the age of 18 and got a job as a shipping clerk. My next job was butchering at a plant that processed boneless beef. Couldn't see much future there. Next, I got a job as a Greyhound Bus Driver. The money was good. The work was pleasant, but I couldn't see it as leading to retirement. Finally I took the plunge and went into business for myself.

"I managed to raise enough money with my savings to invest in a combination motel, restaurant, grocery, and service station. It didn't take long to get my eyes opened. In order to keep that business going my wife and I worked from dawn to dusk, 20 hours a day, seven days a week. Putting in all those hours didn't match my idea of independence and it gave me no time for my favorite sport—golf! Finally we both agreed that I should look for something else.

"I found it. Not right away. I investigated a lot of businesses offered as franchises. I felt that I wanted the guidance of an experienced company—wanted to have the benefit of the plans that had brought success to others, plus the benefit of running my own business under an established name that had national recognition.

"Most of the franchises offered were too costly for me. Temporarily all my capital was frozen in the motel. But I found that

the Duraclean franchise offered what I had been looking for.

"Only \$5,900 starts you in your own business. And, if you qualify, Duraclean has enough confidence in your success that they will finance the balance. The total cash investment is \$14,800.

"I could work it as a one-man business to start, and operate from my home. No office or shop or other overhead, no salaries to pay. Equipment would fit in my car trunk. (I bought the truck later, out of profits.) Best of all, there was no ceiling on my earnings. I could build a business as big as my ambition and energy dictated. I could put on as many men as I needed to cover my volume. And I could build little by little, or as fast as I wished.

"So, I started. I took the wonderful training furnished by the company. When I was ready I followed the simple plan outlined in the training. During the first period I did all the service work myself. By doing it myself, I could make much more per hour than I had ever made on a salary. Later, I would hire men, train them, pay them well, and still make an hourly profit on their time that made my idea of retirement possible—I had joined the country club and now I could play golf whenever I wished.

"What is this wonderful business? It's Duraclean. And, what is Duraclean? It's an improved, space-age process for cleaning upholstered furniture, rugs and tacked down carpets. It not only cleans but enlivens and sparkles up the colors. It does not wear down the fiber or drive part of the dirt into the base of the rug as machine scrubbing does. Instead it *lifts out* the dirt with absorbent dry foam.

"Furniture dealers and department stores refer their customers to the Duraclean Specialist. Insurance men say Duraclean can save them money on fire claims. Hotels, motels, specialty shops and big stores make annual contracts for keeping carpets and furniture clean.

"Well, that's the business I was able to

start with such a small investment. That's the business I built up over a period of eight years. And, that's the business I sold out at a substantial profit before I was fifty."

Would you like to have the freedom and independence enjoyed by Mr. Haikey? You can. Let us send you the facts. Mail the coupon, and you'll receive all the details, absolutely without obligation. No salesman will ever call on you. When you receive our illustrated booklet, you'll learn how we show you STEP BY STEP how to get customers, and how to have your customers get you more customers from their recommendations.

This is an opportunity for a career you will enjoy far more than a routine job. You make many friends who appreciate your quality services.

With no obligation, we'll mail you a 32-page booklet explaining the business. Then you, and you alone, in the privacy of your home, can decide. Don't delay. Mail the coupon, now.



Duraclean International



The first step—send for FREE Booklet today!

Duraclean International
4-9X1 Duraclean Bldg. Deerfield, IL 60015
WITHOUT OBLIGATION send free booklet that tells how I can have a Duraclean business. No salesman will call.
PLEASE PRINT
Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____



A Soviet SS-9 in Red Square in 1967; the missile is a progenitor of today's intercontinental ballistic SS-18, which has never been shown publicly

MEN OF THE YEAR

Debate over a Doctrine

Soviet nuclear strategy has aroused U.S. suspicions

At the heart of the Soviet-American confrontation lies one momentous riddle: Are the Soviets willing to start a nuclear war, and do they think they could win it?

The public and official Soviet answer to that question is a resounding no. Leonid Brezhnev declared several times that a nuclear war would be "unwinnable" and "madness." Just five months before his death in 1982, he sent a formal message to the United Nations declaring that the Kremlin "assumes an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons." Brezhnev challenged everyone else to make a similar pledge, a challenge that the U.S. promptly declined. (According to U.S. nuclear doctrine, it is only the longstanding American threat to use nuclear weapons against a Soviet invasion of Western Europe that deters Moscow from any such attack.)

The official Soviet posture has not changed since Yuri Andropov came to power. A few weeks after he was named to succeed Brezhnev, the Soviet party chief declared, "A nuclear war, whether big or small, whether limited or total, must not be allowed to break out."

But apart from what top Kremlin officials may say in public, the question remains: What are the Soviets really thinking? Though no definitive answer is possible, some U.S. experts believe that key Soviet military strategists consider a nuclear war "winnable." "What is most disturbing about what we observe from the Soviet command . . . system," Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle testified before a House committee, "is that it looks to us like one that proceeds from the belief that nuclear war could be fought and won."

One troubling implication in that idea is that if a nuclear war could be won, it would probably be won by the nation that struck first, by surprise. No top U.S. official

would say that Moscow might be designing its strategy based on such a preemptive strike, but some think-tank strategists are less reticent. Says Raymond Garthoff of the Brookings Institution: "If war came, they would probably launch an all-out attack on the U.S. They might go first, with everything."

There is relatively little to support such a judgment. The evidence most often cited is an article by Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, chief of staff of the Soviet armed forces, in the 1980 edition of the *Soviet Military Encyclopedia*. "If a nuclear war is foisted upon the Soviet Union," wrote Ogarkov, the Soviets "will have definite advantages stemming from the just goals of the war and the advanced nature of their social and state system." This, he concluded, "creates objective possibilities for them to achieve victory."

When some conservative Western Kremlinologists began to interpret that bit of ideological breast beating as a strategy for nuclear victory, the Moscow press took pains to discredit such a view. Western experts, however, have found other, less ambiguous Soviet predictions of nuclear victory. For example, the 1972 edition of the book *Marxism-Leninism on War and Army*, written by a collective of authors, declared, "Today's weapons make it possible to achieve strategic objectives very quickly. The very first nuclear attack on the enemy may inflict such immense casualties and produce such vast destruction that his economic, moral-political and military capabilities will collapse."

Just how authoritative such writings are remains debatable, but the fact that this book appeared in the early 1970s indicates that it had no immediate effect on Soviet strategy. Indeed, there is evidence that Soviet assessments of nuclear war have become more cautious in recent years. Says Adam Ulam, director of Har-

vard's Russian Research Center: "When the Soviets' nuclear power was puny, in the mid-'50s, they were boasting and bluffing that war would mean the end of capitalism, and socialism would emerge triumphant. Since then, on several occasions, the Soviets have conceded that the results of nuclear war are incalculable and most likely cataclysmic."

More important, perhaps, is the fact that the Soviets, like the U.S., repeatedly carry out military exercises that are planned as part of a nuclear war. These include the simulated launching of nuclear missiles. Despite the widespread idea that any nuclear war would be over in a day or two, the Soviet maneuvers assume a prolonged conflict. In the fall of 1980, for example, they spent several days practicing the reloading of 25 to 40 silos housing giant intercontinental SS-18 missiles. But such maneuvers might have been primarily designed to show the U.S. that the Soviets believe they could survive and retaliate against a U.S. nuclear attack.

One of the basic reasons for Western suspicion of Soviet strategy is that Western analysts tend to interpret even defensive preparations for war as signs of a willingness to wage war. The Soviets disagree. They suffered a surprise attack by the Germans in 1941, and Marxist ideology tells them they will be attacked again. To make whatever preparations can be made seems only sensible. More than a few U.S. experts believe the West should adopt similar policies.

Strategists who suspect the Soviets of thinking that a nuclear war is winnable have become more influential under the Reagan Administration, but there are still many who disagree. Says Gregory Flynn, deputy director of the Paris-based Atlantic Institute: "The most important thing that we always overlook is that everything the Soviets have ever said or written has as its starting point that we started the war. The preponderance of evidence is that the Soviets just do not want to fight a war."

—By Otto Friedrich, Reported by John Moody/Moscow and Bruce W. Nelan/Washington

The View from the Street Corner

Americans feel anxiety, but little antagonism toward the Soviets

When Ronald Reagan won the presidency by a landslide, he seemed to have a national mandate backing his repeated calls for stronger U.S. defenses and a forceful response to any Soviet challenge. But how solid is that support three years later?

To help answer this question, TIME commissioned a special poll by Yankelovich, Skelly & White, Inc. The results indicate that a great many Americans have reservations about the Reagan Administration's policies toward the Soviet Union. Although most of them approve of the President's assertive use of U.S. power, 60% say they worry a lot about "the possibility of nuclear war." To expand on the poll, TIME correspondents and stringers in 28 U.S. cities questioned a random sampling of people—not experts, just ordinary people—to see what lay behind their views and how those views had changed during the past year.

One of the most striking findings in these street-corner interviews is the relative rarity of any sharp hostility toward the U.S.S.R., and particularly toward the Soviet people. There is wariness and anxiety in the land, considerably more so than a year ago, but very little of the antagonism that marked the height of the cold war in the early 1950s. The Soviets were widely regarded then as a belligerent, ruthless and implacable enemy; Americans today seem more inclined to emphasize the similarities between the two nations and to blame their conflicts largely on misunderstandings.

There are still many people (some surveys put the total at about 20%) who share Reagan's hostility toward what he has called "the evil empire." "I think we're at war, without shooting each other directly," says Dan Wolf, 56, a sales executive in Atlanta. "I think they've been planning military moves against us for years." Sara Henderson, 39, who owns a flower store in Boulder, Colo., agrees: "Their pattern of aggression ever since World War II has been very deliberate, and planned thoroughly and thoughtfully."

Hammond Chaffetz, 76, an antitrust lawyer in Chicago, has been suspicious even longer, going back to New Deal days. Says he: "We could never trust the Russians then, and we cannot now. They have newer equipment than ours and the strongest conventional forces in the world today. If we gave up competing with them and let them have the balance of power, Europe would immediately give up on us."

The history of European conflicts

strikes other people very differently. Little Rock's W.J. Wisor, 66, a retired executive of the U.S. Department of Labor, recalls when Moscow and Washington were allies. "I was in World War II, and had it not been for the Soviet Union, we would be doing the goose step and shouting 'Sieg Heil!' They have been invaded; we have not. They don't like our attitude of showing our military in their backyard. They are protecting their interests, just as we would do."


Quite apart from World War II, many Americans share Wisor's view of the Sovi-

and essentially helpless. Toward the Kremlin, on the other hand, they feel some anger and considerable anxiety, and both feelings have been increasing for a variety of reasons. Many cite the shooting down of the Korean airliner in September; others speak of the Middle East or Poland or the arms race; some, like Harry Lockenour, 46, an autoworker at the General Motors plant in Pontiac, Mich., just say, "I think they're getting more aggressive all the time."

"They do more to make us feel threatened because of their doctrine that they must conquer the earth," says Richard Hammer, 49, a utility-company executive in Suffern, N.Y. "Up until lately, I didn't think about it too much, but with the U.S. Pershing missiles being sent to Europe, and the Soviet walkout in the arms talks,

I've become more afraid about what could happen. I think we made a mistake with the Pershing missiles. [The Soviets] can deploy more missiles too. I'm wary now."

"I can't say I'm afraid of them," says Leo Rasmussen, 42, mayor of Nome, Alaska. "But angry? Yeah. I'm more angry than I was a year ago. Especially after the Korean airliner incident." Deedee Corradini, 39, who has a master's degree in psychology and runs a consulting firm in Salt Lake City, is well aware that "the more you fear, the more hostile you become," but the destruction of the Korean jet changed her views too. "I used to think the Soviets weren't as bad as they had been painted," she says, "but the airliner attack has made me more suspicious of their intentions." Maureen Morrison, 22, who works as a security guard in Cambridge, Mass., says of the incident, "I used to think they were just being made out to be the bad guys, but now I'm beginning to think they are bad."



et Union not as an ideologically fanatic opponent but as an equal counterpart to the U.S. "We're both hostile to each other, and they're just as right as we are," says Robert Mulligan, 20, an electrician in Palisades Park, N.J. Agrees Dorothy Bender, 63, who heads the senior citizens' club in Huntington Woods, Mich.: "I don't think they do any more to us than we do to them. They're a power, and they want to let people know they're a power and not to mess with them." Judy Henning, 45, an executive in Los Angeles, puts it another way: "The Russians are as frightened of us as we are of them."

Most Americans make a clear distinction between the Soviet rulers and their citizens. "I don't think the Russian people are any different from Americans," says Jill Breslow, 21, a senior at Brandeis University. Despite their sympathy, however, most Americans also regard the people of the Soviet Union as misled, misinformed

The fears that Americans have about Moscow often appear to be part of a general anxiety about leadership on both sides of the confrontation, about a situation that seems beyond anyone's control. Alice Gagnard, 26, a professor of journalism at Marquette University, cites the downing of the Korean plane as an example of Soviet misjudgment and overreaction, but also as evidence of a wider problem. "Their threat has been on my mind more since we changed Administrations and since they changed leaders," she says. "We both have contingency plans against each other, and our level of preparedness has taken us beyond the question of a freeze. It's now a matter of being in the same room of explosives with all those matches."

Karrrie Olson, 26, a clothing store executive in Seattle, feels that the Soviets have become more menacing, and she says, "I am frightened that as time goes

Buick's Little Limousine welcomes you.

The Buick Skylark may be somewhat smaller than the traditional limousine, but it has some of the nicer attributes of the traditional limousine.

Its styling is neat, clean, almost classic.

More importantly, Skylark offers a rare combination of practical packaging, front-wheel drive—and many luxuries normally found in larger automobiles.

Rich, comfortable seats. Well-designed


instruments. Power steering. Power brakes. And more. For a car that's compact in dimensions but generous with amenities, visit your Buick dealer and buckle yourself into the Skylark.

It's the Limousine for people who do their own driving.

Wouldn't you really rather have a Buick?



Introducing a new way to
take one of the most recommended
liquid cold medicines in history.



MORE doctors
and pharmacists
recommend
Triaminic® Cold
Syrup than any other cold
liquid brand.* You can't beat
it for relief of cold symptoms.

Now you can get the
same kind of relief in a tablet.


Triaminic® Cold Tablets,
like our Syrup, give you
prompt relief for the stuffy,

runny nose of a cold.

We're also introducing
Triaminicol® Multi-Symptom
Cold Tablets. Like
Triaminicol® Multi-Symptom
Cold Syrup, our new
Triaminicol Multi-Symptom
Cold Tablets go to work on
nasal congestion, frequent
coughing and runny nose.

Each one contains a
decongestant. Because one

thing you expect from cold medicines is to let you breathe freer, fast. But none of them contain aspirin.



*Triaminic®
Cold Tablets*
Stuffy nose
Runny nose
Postnasal drip

Triaminicol® Multi-Symptom Cold Tablets
Nasal congestion
Runny nose
Frequent, annoying cough

Because we feel aspirin or other pain relievers are something you should take only when the symptoms require it.

Of course, there's the rest of our liquid cold medicines.

Triaminic-DM® Cough Formula effectively relieves an annoying, persistent cough and nasal congestion.

And Triaminic® Expecto-rant can break up the congestion of a dry, hacking cough.

So don't overmedicate your cold with unnecessary ingredients. Know your symptoms better.

AND try Triaminic® Cold Tablets and Triaminicol® Multi-Symptom Cold Tablets.

Not only can you get fast, effective cold relief.

Now, with our tablets you can take it with you, also.

15833A



Why take more than you need.



In 1905, Cecilia Biegel tried to break the ice with Richard Lemley by lighting up a cigarette.

He was glad to oblige her.

You've come a long way, baby.

VIRGINIA SLIMS *Lights*



Fashions: Bill Haarc Ltd.

Warning: The Surgeon General Has Determined That Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Your Health.

Regular: 9 mg "tar," 0.7 mg nicotine—Menthol: 8 mg "tar," 0.6 mg nicotine av. per cigarette, FTC Report Mar '83.

© Philip Morris Inc. 1983



on, as they acquire more and more power, someone—not necessarily the Soviets, but someone—might blow up the world. But when I think about who it might actually be that would start a nuclear war, it's just kind of a blur in my mind."

Most Americans speak of the Soviets as people they have never seen, except as figures occasionally spotted on television, but a good many are trying to remedy that state of mutual isolation. Some members of the United Church of Christ, for example, invited the Soviets to send a group of visitors on a tour of New England. Last April came a newspaper editor, a Russian Orthodox bishop, a scientist and six others, who stayed in rural homes and ate potluck dinners. "It was the first time many of these people had ever done anything like this," says Elizabeth Gardner, who helped organize the tour and whose husband Clint was finishing an exchange visit to the Soviet Union in December. "It proved to a lot of people that the Soviets are human beings with human concerns, just like us," she says. "I think Americans tend to forget that."

"I've lived in both countries, and both remind me of people looking at the undersides of cars—seeing only the bad side," says Dr. James Muller, who was one of the first Americans to study medicine at a Soviet university, and who is now trying to arrange for at least 30 doctors from each nation to visit the other side's hospitals next June. "That is not to say that the Soviet Union is all good. It isn't. No one is. But there is some good, and our objectives, to some degree, are the same. We should concentrate on that."

Despite their anxiety, Americans seem to remain convinced that the ultimate nightmare will never occur. Partly this is a belief that the Soviets are not strong enough to attack, that deterrence works. Bailey Thompson, 34, editorial-page editor of the Shreveport (La.) *Journal*, recently returned from a three-week trip through the Soviet Union, and suspects that "they are changing their strategy in Western Europe, and may be contemplating a nonnuclear blitzkrieg." But he adds: "Right now, I don't see any possibility of overt action against the West." Michael Fitch, 36, an electrician from Waterford, Mich., puts it simply: "We have our missiles and they have theirs."

Partly, though, the belief that the unthinkable will remain unthinkable is a matter less of strategic judgment than of inherent optimism, or perhaps simply faith. Tom Allan, 36, is a program-control supervisor for Raytheon in Portsmouth, R.I. Much of Raytheon's work is military, but Allan refuses to believe that nuclear war is possible. "I think the people of the world will prevent it," he says, "the everyday people, the bulk of the populace of the world. I don't think anyone really wants to have a head-to-head confrontation that might result in something that could annihilate the entire world." —By Otto Friedrich. Reported by Robert Carney/New York and Benjamin W. Cate/Los Angeles, with other bureaus

Answers to a Poll: Let's Talk

A large number of Americans generally accept President Reagan's view of the Soviet regime, but they have doubts about the wisdom of his Administration's policies. While they approve of the President's assertive military approach, they believe he should put more emphasis on negotiations. They see the need to reduce the danger of nuclear war as the No. 1 problem confronting the nation, and they do not feel Reagan is handling that problem well. They want Reagan to meet Soviet Leader Yuri Andropov in a summit.

These are the main findings that emerge from a public opinion poll conducted for TIME by Yankelovich, Skelly & White, Inc.* The responses are sometimes contradictory, for they are the views of a people divided over how best to confront the ominous changes in the relations between East and West. Overall, the emphasis is on making a greater effort for peace.

More than half the people questioned think that U.S. relations with the U.S.S.R. have deteriorated within the past year. While 50% say their own views of the Soviets have remained about the same, 45% report that their opinion of Moscow has worsened. Yet Americans consistently regard the Soviet people with considerable warmth. Fully 88% agree that "the Russian people could be our friends if their leaders had a different attitude."

Andropov seems to have had little effect on these Americans; 67% endorse the view that "he is no better or worse than any of the others. They are all part of the same system." Despite this, however, 60% think Andropov "knows that the Soviet Union is in just as much danger as the United States, and therefore is willing to negotiate an arms-control agreement."

Americans apparently believe the danger of war is increasing. Though only 30% think the Soviets have become stronger than the U.S. (43% thought that in June), 61% say they "worry a lot" about the Soviet military buildup, and 60% say the same about the possibility of nuclear war. Both figures have risen nearly 10 points since June.

A remarkable number of those worriers expect to see their nightmares come true. Fully 49% foresee "some chance" of nuclear war in Europe within the next five years, and 17% see "a good chance."


Though the Soviets are the main cause of these anxieties, a surprising number of Americans see fault on both sides. More than three-quarters endorse the proposition that "the U.S. has to accept some of the blame for the misunderstandings that have plagued U.S.-Soviet relations." In assessing Reagan's handling of various problems, only 26% credit him with doing a good job on avoiding war. That is his lowest rating on any major issue. Says Opinion Analyst Daniel Yankelovich: "Reagan has proved that he can be tough, but he has not yet proved that he can be a peacemaker. It is unlikely that this issue will escape bitter and partisan debate in an election year."

The responses are replete with contradictions; 54% agree that every sign of Soviet influence must be contained, "with military force, if necessary, whatever the risk." But even larger majorities recognize that "we do not have the power to contain Soviet influence everywhere in the world" (79%) and that a "military containment policy is what got us into trouble in Viet Nam" (83%). And 93% agree that "picking a fight is too dangerous in a nuclear world" and that "we should be thinking in terms of peaceful solutions." As for who should negotiate and when, 76% favor a meeting between Reagan and Andropov now.

*The findings are based on a telephone survey of 1,000 registered voters made from Dec. 6 to Dec. 8. The potential sampling error is plus or minus 3%. When these results are compared with the results of previous polls, the potential sampling error is plus or minus 4.5%.

RISK OF WAR

"The Soviets are just as afraid of nuclear war as we are, and therefore it is in our mutual interest to find ways to negotiate."



Four Who Also Shaped Events

Local Heroes Shouldering Global Burdens

It is easy, even tempting, to think of them all as old, tough-as-leather Marines. But they were also Army and Navy, cooks and drivers, pilots and paratroopers. Most of them were young, and had never seen combat before.

The Marines' sacrifice in Beirut was disproportionate: 220 of the 241 killed in the headquarters bombing, plus 16 more hit by snipers and shrapnel. All told this year, 278 Americans who had volunteered to serve their country in uniform returned home from combat in coffins. The week most of them died, President Reagan reminded the public that the U.S. had "global responsibilities." That notion, a bit textbookish to most citizens, is a good deal less abstract to the 2.1 million members of the American military. The grittiest responsibilities are theirs.

Literally. The sand gets into everything, always. In Grenada and Lebanon, as in more peaceful G.I. terrains, the sand is in the dregs of the cloying powdered orange juice, gums up the bunkmate's cassette player, sticks to sweaty necks. The troops sit talking for hours in close tents and stifling bunkers, young men who hope, because they are lance corporals and gunnery sergeants, that they are above whimpering. The 1982 high school graduate from Pontiac, Mich., writing a letter home ("Don't worry, *really!*"), shakes his dried-up Bic. An infantryman with a tiny mirror, still not used to the G.I. buzz cut, stares at himself. A lieutenant from Live Oak, Fla., peeks nervously over the sandbag ramparts and wonders about the alien landscape. A private forks out the last globs of mushy tinned meat and then, dog-tired from worrying about mortar rounds all day, snuffs his cigarette in the greasy C-ration can and sleeps.

Each inhabits his own singular combat zone. Yet a provocative phrase cropped up in news reports: "Not since the end of the war in Viet Nam..." Some of the analogies were impressionistic and wrong: the Middle East, Central America and the Caribbean are not Indochina. But some of the bench marks were plain, blunt facts. Not since Viet Nam, until Beirut, had so many U.S. servicemen been killed in a single day. Not since then, until Grenada, had U.S. servicemen launched a combat operation of such size. Not since then, until a Navy A-6 was shot down over Lebanon, had a U.S. fighter pilot died in combat; not since then, until the capture by Syrians of the same A-6's bombardier, had a U.S. serviceman been a P.O.W. Lieut. Robert O. Goodman will be freed, the Syrians said, only "when the war has ended."

Who knew that a war had begun? The troops in Beirut were there to keep peace. Yet as Philosopher Herbert Spencer wrote, long before the U.S. became a superpower, "Soldiers are policemen who act in unison."

The year 1983 marked the tenth anniversary of the U.S. all-volunteer force. Americans expect national pride to draw enough youngsters into service, but such volunteerism is not universal. Elsewhere, including nearly all of Europe, conscription is the rule. In the U.S., about 6,000 new recruits, 600 of them women, are signing up every week. High unemployment is one prod. But there is another, probably more important reason: a Pentagon recruitment official calls it "a renewed spirit of patriotism."

The troops are stationed in 112 countries, from Iceland to the Philippines. But this year, at least, the most visible departures and homecomings have had a U.S. locus, the stretch of North Carolina that includes the Marines' Camp Lejeune and the Army's Fort Bragg. This month, 2,000 troops returned from Grenada, and



U.S. SERVICEMEN

1,800 Marines, some aboard the *Iwo Jima*, came back from Lebanon. They stepped into a familiar dream. Bands played. Infants were tweaked. Couples swung M-16s out of the way and hugged. The troops were home. They had served, and served well.

Eloquent Pilgrim with a Message of Peace

In a year that saw ever rising fears of nuclear war, a white-robed figure journeyed the globe to proclaim a yearning for peace and justice. John Paul II, history's most traveled Pope, set out on spectacular, taxing pilgrimages to two of the world's most troubled regions: violence-torn Central America and his dispirited homeland, Poland. As always, John Paul's charismatic personality attracted millions of the faithful, and his words and actions rarely failed to bring political reactions. He roared "*Silencio!*" to unruly Sandinistas who disrupted a Mass he was celebrating in Nicaragua; he made a surprise visit to the grave of El Salvador's martyred Archbishop Oscar Romero; and he bluntly told the government of dirt-poor Haiti, "Something must change here." In Poland he met with General Wojciech Jaruzelski and called for the unshackling of Solidarity, the banned labor union. He also met privately with his native country's most celebrated nonperson, Nobel Peace Prizewinner Lech Walesa.

Throughout the year, John Paul continued to command television screens and front pages in a conscious effort to gain maximum publicity for his message of peace in the world. Everywhere he went, the Pope preached on the mounting dangers of the buildup of atomic weapons; he sent written appeals to Soviet Leader Yuri Andropov and President Ronald Reagan to keep the arms-limitation talks alive. The Pope also achieved a long-sought goal: an agreement, which will soon be announced, to exchange diplomatic representatives with Washington.

The Pope's antinuclear stance was pivotal to his message of the absolute value of human life. This principle led him to denounce abortion, to question research in armaments and human genetic engineering, and to intervene, unsuccessfully, in the executions of condemned men in Guatemala and Florida.

Increasingly, John Paul's pontificate appeared to be summed up by this phrase from a speech he gave to Indians in Guatemala: "No more divorce between faith and life." He continued to be outspoken in his opposition to Marxist-influenced liberation theology, contending that political preaching must reject violence and be rooted in Christian teaching. The Pope demanded human rights and justice from governments of the left, Poland and Nicaragua, as well as the right, Guatemala and the Philippines.

John Paul did not escape criticism. Roman Catholic liberals in the West complained that he failed to practice at the Vatican what he preached as he traveled the world. To them, justice within the church would allow for the ordination of women, the right of priests to marry, and freedom for Catholic couples to use birth control without guilt. Some Protestants also found fault

with what they saw as his inflexibility in leading the church. Although John Paul honored the name of Martin Luther in his 500th anniversary year, and became the first Pope ever to preach in a Lutheran church, the *Christian Century*, a U.S. Protestant weekly, described him as "unbendingly orthodox if not downright medieval." John Paul appeared convinced, however, that in order to survive, the Catholic Church must regain its cohesion and discipline. Among his many disputed steps toward that end: warning U.S. bishops about the lack of discipline in the huge American



POPE JOHN PAUL II

church, and pursuing investigations of its seminaries and religious orders.

Slowed only slightly by aftereffects of the attempt on his life in 1981, John Paul was again fit and in command. As if to prove to the world that he does indeed practice what he preaches, at year's end he requested a private meeting with his assailant, Mehmet Ali Agca, which is expected to take place this week. At 63, John Paul II is still young for a Pope; his powerful and eloquent moral voice seems likely to be heard for many years to come.

Triumphant Leader at the Helm

For Margaret Thatcher, the challenge in 1983 was to top 1982, when a triumphant battle with Argentina over a sprinkling of islands in the South Atlantic exhilarated the British and made the Prime Minister almost as popular among her countrymen as Bonnie Prince William. What better way to match a victory abroad than with a victory at home? That Thatcher did, and as usual with the "Iron Lady," halfhearted results would not do. In the most sweeping British electoral contest since 1945, her Conservatives captured a 144-seat majority in the 650-member Parliament.

Appropriately enough, the Prime Minister started 1983 with Union Jacks flying by visiting the Falklands. Accorded a heroine's welcome, she basked in remembered glory, then returned home to call elections for June, a year earlier than necessary. Against a backdrop of angry protests directed at the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles on British soil and unemployment at a postwar high of 13.3%, Thatcher ran as the resolute leader who would take on all opponents, be they leftists from Brighton or generals from Buenos Aires. Fortune gave her an opposition split between a Labor Party crippled by ideological warfare and an untested centrist alliance of Liberals and Social Democrats. Always ahead in the polls, the indefatigable Thatcher campaigned as if she were always trailing. It never mattered whether she faced a phalanx of WE LOVE MAGGIE signs or a fusillade of eggs: the wave never weakened, the smile never flagged.

On the day of her romp, an astute adviser warned Thatcher that victory would not bring five years of smooth ruling. He was right. Thatcher's reshuffled Cabinet performed poorly in Parliament. An operation for a detached retina slowed her down over the summer. Scandal struck when it was revealed that Trade Minister and Tory Party Chairman Cecil Parkinson had fathered a child by his secretary. The wayward colleague eventually resigned, but Thatcher's waffling over whether he should quit did her no good. Labor rose from its electoral ashes to choose bright, eloquent Welshman Neil Kinnock, 41, as its new leader. From Thatcher's Tory ranks came broadsides ripping her economic policy, her lack of compassion, her foreign dealings. Press Baron Rupert Murdoch, long an ardent backer, echoed the feelings of many when he declared: "She has run out of puff."

Even Thatcher's sturdy friendship with Ronald Reagan suffered strains when American troops invaded Grenada, a Commonwealth member. The Prime Minister asked the President by telephone not to go through with the operation; afterward, she uttered her harshest words yet about the U.S. Said Thatcher: "If you are going to pronounce a new law that wherever Communism reigns against the will of the people the United States shall enter, then we are going to have some really terrible wars." She opposed U.S. reprisal attacks in Lebanon, where Britain had contributed 100 men to the 6,000-member Multi-National Force, and criticized Washington's decision to resume arms sales to Argentina.

As the turbulent year drew to a close, Thatcher remained steadfast as ever. In India for the Commonwealth Conference, she presented



MARGARET THATCHER

an award to Poet Mahadevi Varma, quoting lines she might have written herself.

*Take the boat to midstream
Though it sink, you shall get across
Let dedication be your only helmsman
He will see you through.*

The redoubtable Thatcher sails into 1984 confident that her ship will weather any storm.

Judicial Command of a Landmark Case

It is by far the largest corporate divestiture in history, dwarfing the court-mandated division of the old Standard Oil empire in 1911. And much more is at stake than the fortunes and future of a company that last year had a million workers and revenues of \$69 billion. The split of American Telephone and Telegraph



JUDGE HAROLD GREENE

into eight smaller companies, which takes effect on New Year's Day, will be felt by every person in the U.S. who uses a phone, or expects to benefit from new communications technologies that the breakup should inspire. The man who supervised this landmark case is an unassuming, soft-spoken German refugee, virtually unknown outside a small circle of jurists. Yet Federal Judge Harold H. Greene, 60, in an extraordinary display of judicial activism, has, almost singlehandedly, determined the shape of the nation's new telecommunications system.

In 1978 Greene took over the Justice Department's suit to break up A T & T. In a manner that some decried as autocratic, Greene fought off Government requests for delays, including one that would have had Congress settle the matter through legislation. "Bizarre" was the judge's crisp response. In January 1982 Bell executives and Assistant Attorney General William Baxter reached an out-of-court settlement. That deal eventually saw the world's largest company divided into the "new" A T & T, which will provide long-distance phone service and be able to enter unregulated fields of computers and telecommunications, and seven regional operating companies, which will supply local phone service.


It was Greene who ruled on the multitude of details that gave the accord its final form. Says he: "There would be nights when I would wake up and couldn't get back to sleep. So I would go downstairs and write. The staff had a pool going on how many pages of typing I would bring in here in the morning."

Born Heinz Grünhaus in what is now East Germany, Greene and his parents fled the Nazis in 1939, going to Belgium, France and Spain before the U.S. He returned to Europe in 1945 as a staff sergeant in Army Intelligence. Greene studied law at George Washington University, graduating first in his night-school class while also working full time for the Justice Department.

Greene's link with the Justice Department proved fruitful. In late 1957 Congress created the Civil Rights Division, and Greene became the first head of the appeals and research section. He supervised the drafting of legislation that became the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In that year, Lyndon Johnson named Greene to be a judge (later chief judge) in the District of Columbia's local court system.

Some critics, including top A T & T officials, complain that Greene's role in the breakup of the Bell System was a classic example of excessive judicial power. Here was one appointed official deciding virtually by himself how the U.S. phone system would operate. Greene argues that he was giving substance to the deliberately vague language of antitrust laws. Says he: "Judges cannot be afraid to exercise their legitimate role."

Greene has also been a participant in the telecommunications revolution. Last month, like thousands of other Americans, he went out and bought new telephones for his home.



Tightened security around the Marine compound at Beirut airport: a sentry guards the only open gate, backed by oil drums and earth embankment

Nation

"Nothing but Quicksand"

If it is hard to keep the Marines in Lebanon, it is harder to pull them out

Are we to let the terrorists win? Are we to say that, well, if terrorists are going to be active, we'll give in to them, we'll back away?" Ronald Reagan was resolute as he answered a barrage of questions about the perilous role of the U.S. Marines in Lebanon at his final press conference of 1983. One of his advisers explained that the President gets more determined to keep the Marines on their mission with each new terrorist atrocity. Said the aide: "People who don't understand that, don't understand Ronald Reagan."

But pressure on the President to withdraw the Marines from Lebanon is building. Confusion about their role and doubts about their ability to carry it out are evident across the political spectrum. A Harris poll shows that 64% of Americans now want to "pull all the Marines out of Lebanon within a few weeks or months." The figure stood at 54% in a similar Harris survey in October.

Two highly critical reports added fuel to the intensifying national debate on the Marine deployment. Both spoke of the lax security around the Marine compound at the Beirut airport before it was blown up by a suicidal truck driver on Oct. 23, killing 241 U.S. servicemen (see following sto-

ry). Republican Congressman Larry Hopkins, one of the authors of a report by a House subcommittee, went beyond the security question to criticize the "peacekeeping" role of the Marines. Said he: "The people in the Mideast have been fighting since the days of Abraham. Asking our Marines to stop the fighting there is like trying to change the course of Niagara Falls with a bucket." Hopkins said that General John Vessey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had testified before his committee that all five chiefs oppose the current use of the Marines.


Many press commentators, even Reagan supporters like conservative Columnist William F. Buckley Jr., faulted the Administration policy. Buckley agreed with Reagan that terrorists should not decide where U.S. Marines should go. But he argued that the acts of terrorists should not determine "where and when the U.S. Marines must remain." Buckley urged the President to set a date for withdrawing the Marines, thus unlinking their departure from any attacks by the factions fighting in Lebanon.

After meeting with their constituents during the current congressional recess, Senators and Representatives reported a rising chorus of complaints about the Ma-

lines' presence in Lebanon. A common concern was that the roughly 1,800 Marines cannot have much impact in the warring nation, except to draw fire from one or more of the religious groups that see the U.S. as an enemy. "The President has overstated the objective," contended Indiana Congressman Lee Hamilton, a conservative Democrat and a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. "We're not going to achieve it: a solid, united Lebanon from border to border. We're not willing to commit the military assets to achieve that objective."

At a town meeting in a conservative county in Oklahoma, Democratic Senator David Boren reported that a Marine veteran drew loud applause when he said that sending Marines to Lebanon was akin to sending them to Northern Ireland. "I'm speaking as a hawk," the veteran said to Boren. "I want you to get those boys home as quickly as possible." Florida Congressman Claude Pepper said his Miami-area constituents "see nothing but quicksand over there."

Republican opposition on Capitol Hill is also growing, from Senator Barry Goldwater on the right to moderate Maryland Senator Charles Mathias. Mathias worries about the possibility of more



Uncompleted underground Marine quarters is topped by sandbags, left; man-made hill provides better view of nearby roads

American casualties. "I used to serve on the *New Jersey*, and I know that ship," he said of the battleship stationed off the Lebanon coast. "I've been concerned with what would happen if an SS-21 was targeted on her." He referred to a Soviet-built surface-to-surface missile known to be deployed by Syrian forces in Lebanon. Navy officers contend that the ships are well defended against such attacks. Still, any missile hit could cause heavy damage.

There will almost certainly be a move to withdraw the Marines when Congress reconvenes in late January, unless Reagan takes some action in the interim, like redeploying the Marines to more defensible positions. The legislators are in an awkward position. Last September they approved a resolution giving Reagan authority under the War Powers Act to keep the Marines in Lebanon for a maximum of 18 months. Many Congressmen now contend that the U.S. role in Lebanon has been changed by the Administration from neutral peace keeper to active military supporter of the central government headed by Amin Gemayel.

The lawmakers may try to pass a "sense of Congress" resolution, which would not be binding on the President and thus not subject to his veto. Contends New York Democrat Sam Stratton, whose House Armed Services Committee will consider such a resolution: "If a large majority said we should get the hell out of there, I think the President would abide by that."

But White House aides argued last week that an abrupt Marine pull-out would have serious consequences. "The impact on the Gemayel government would be devastating," said one official. "His government would probably fall." At the same time, the

aide said, the other nations contributing to the Multi-National Force in Lebanon—France, Italy and Britain—"would dash for the exit as well." Israel, feeling abandoned, would become "an unpredictable factor" in Lebanon, possibly even partitioning the southern sector of Lebanon to protect its northern border. Syria would emerge stronger, being seen as having faced down the U.S. superpower single-handed. The more moderate Arab states would find it even more difficult to cooperate with the U.S., which would be perceived as unreliable. "When you look at these elements coldly," said the Reagan aide, "you realize that you have to ponder long and hard before you cut and run."

Italy, which has the largest contingent ashore in Lebanon (about 2,050 men), has set a withdrawal policy of its own. If there is an agreement in the peace talks in Geneva between the Gemayel government and the various factions vying for power, Rome will pull out its troops as no longer needed. If those talks fail, the Italians will withdraw anyway, since there will be no

peace to keep. No matter what happens, the Italian force is gradually being cut in half. Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who has dispatched only 110 troops, largely as a gesture of loyalty to Reagan, has said that she will not "lead a retreat" by the four-nation force. France, which has about 2,000 men in Lebanon and has suffered heavy casualties, including 82 dead, remains steadfast in its role, probably because of its past colonial ties to the long-divided nation.

For the U.S. there appears to be no graceful way out of its Lebanon dilemma. "The best achievable outcome," former Defense Secretary Harold Brown argued last week, would come if the Administration negotiated a partitioning of the country. Israel would control southern Lebanon; Syria would remain in the Bekaa Valley and northern Lebanon; the central government would control whatever it could around Beirut. If the parties will not agree to this, Brown contended, "we should leave anyway and let them find their own solutions."

White House officials countered that partitioning would only worsen the bloodletting in Lebanon and would not provide a lasting solution. There is strong sentiment at the Pentagon for pressuring the torn country's factions to get together by setting a withdrawal deadline. Said Admiral Thomas Moorer, retired Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, reflecting this view: "Our only hope lies with persuading Gemayel that time is running out and convincing the Druze and Shi'ites that their best future lies with some sort of cooperation. Failing that, they face a horrible civil war."

The Administration hopes to buy



In a bunker with Christmas tree and cards

Says a hawk: "Get those boys home."

Nation

time for more diplomatic efforts to get Gemayel and the opposing factions to join in a broadened central government. The Administration apparently will try to ease the pull-out pressure at home by redeploying the Marines to less vulnerable positions. One of the main options now under review at the White House is a proposal to station the Marines along the coastal highway between the Beirut airport and Sidon. That would disperse them over a wider area, distancing them from the high ground from which they were so effectively shelled. In the meantime, the Marines are reinforcing their underground bunkers and building earthworks around their perimeter.

The more optimistic U.S. planners see the present gloom as overdone, pointing out that Syria might ease the situation by acting less intractably; these planners also maintain that the Soviets are trying even harder to rein in Syria. In a best-case scenario, the Lebanese Army would take over from the Marines the task of keeping the Beirut airport open. The Israelis would gradually withdraw from some territory they now hold in southern Lebanon, while the Lebanese Army followed, step by step, to retain control of the vacated areas. Finally, the U.S. Marines would come in behind the Lebanese as a back-up security force. That seems to have been what Reagan had in mind in a puzzling reference at his press conference. Said he: "We have helped train the Lebanese Army and it is a capable force. When the foreign forces get out and the Lebanese military advances to try and establish order in their land, the Multi-National Force is supposed to, behind them, try to achieve some stability and maintain order."

At the same time, there is growing sentiment in the Administration for an option once regarded as unattainable: the use of United Nations forces to replace the four-nation peace-keeping group in Lebanon. Israel had strongly objected to a U.N. presence, claiming it had failed earlier to keep P.L.O. factions from using southern Lebanon to terrorize northern Israel. The Soviet Union was also believed ready to veto any U.N. deployment, which requires Security Council approval. U.N. officials hinted last week that the U.N. is ready to take up such duties, and State Department aides believe that both Israel and the U.S.S.R. may now view a U.N. role more favorably. Declared former Assistant Secretary of State Harold Saunders: "I would have moved heaven and earth to expand the U.N.'s mandate instead of sending the Marines there." The key question, of course, is whether such a force could be approved and deployed in time to shore up the floundering Lebanese government and prevent further tragedies like the bombing of the Marine compound.

—By Ed Magnusson.
Reported by Laurence I. Barrett and Neil MacNeil/
Washington, with other bureaus

"Serious Errors in Judgment"

The Marines draw heavy fire for laxity in the Beirut bombing

By training and tradition, the U.S. Marines prefer going over the top to hunkering down in the trenches. Their indifference to digging in may have proved fatal, however, when a terrorist truck bomb blew apart Marine headquarters in Beirut on Oct. 23, killing 241 men. So concluded a highly critical report last week by the Investigations Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. The hawkish subcommittee, in a document approved by a vote of 9 to 3, charged the Marines with slack security and inadequate intelligence gathering, and accused the entire military chain of command of "very serious errors in judgment."


The Marines also came under criticism from the five-man commission, headed by retired Admiral

opened fire, but it was too late." A week later, Marine Commandant General Paul X. Kelley asserted that the truck slammed through the barbed wire at 60 m.p.h., sped past two armed sentries, burst through an iron gate and jumped over an 18-in. pipe before exploding.

The facts laid out last week in the congressional subcommittee's 78-page report were much different—and much less excusable. At 5 a.m., an hour and 20 minutes before the attack, a truck—possibly the one used in the bombing—circled with its lights off in the parking lot outside Marine headquarters. Only five minutes before the attack, a car pulled up and its driver began taking pictures of the building; one guard later pronounced this "kind of strange." Finally, the red



Kelley and Geraghty at the scene



TIME Diagram by Nigel Holmes

Robert L.J. Long, that investigated the Beirut bombing for the Defense Department. The commission's report "blames a number of people for not exercising what in hindsight would have been better judgment," said Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger. Release of the report was delayed as the White House debated an awkward question: How can the military be held accountable without blaming the Administration for stationing the Marines in Beirut? Courts-martial are unlikely.

The Reagan Administration had at first pictured the tragedy as unavoidable. Four days after the bombing, President Reagan said in a televised speech that the truck "crashed through a series of barriers, including a chain-link fence and barbed-wire entanglements. Guards

Mercedes truck with the fatal bomb rumbled through an iron gate left "invitingly" open, cruised at about 30 m.p.h. past two sentries, who had unloaded M-16s on their shoulders, and then steered between a pair of iron pipes that had been placed outside headquarters not to stop terrorists but to guide traffic. The only impediment was a roll of barbed wire that "just made a popping sound" as the truck drove through, "like someone walking over twigs," recounted a guard. One stunned Marine "kind of stared for a couple of seconds" before loading his rifle, too late. The driver of the truck "looked right at me," said another. "He smiled."

A moment later, the terrorist detonated 12,000 lbs. of explosives. The explosives had been wrapped around gas cylin-

ders and placed on a 7-in. floor of concrete covered with an inch-thick slab of solid marble in order to direct the intensity of the blast upward. Even so, the explosive force drove the truck bed 8 ft. down into the earth.

Before the bombing, the subcommittee reported, the Marines had been inundated with intelligence reports warning against terrorist attacks. Indeed, at times there was a backlog of 36 to 40 hours in communications from the offshore fleet to Marine headquarters. But the intelligence was so "nonspecific" that it was "useless" in building defenses, the congressional investigators found. Moreover, the Marines in Beirut had no intelligence officer trained to evaluate the raw data.

The subcommittee faulted the Marine ground commander, Colonel Timothy Geraghty, for many of the security lapses, but it also criticized the military brass overseeing the peace-keeping operation for doing nothing more than "familiarizing" themselves with Marine security. "If you want to speak of negligence," said the subcommittee's chairman, Alabama Democrat Bill Nichols, "then it goes all the way up to the combined Joint Chiefs of Staff." While not blamed for the disaster, Kelley was upbraided for giving "often inaccurate, erroneous and misleading" statements to the subcommittee in the wake of the bombing. At his news conference last week, Reagan stood up for the general, denying that Kelley "was attempting to cover up for anyone."

While critical of the Marines, the House Armed Services subcommittee agreed with the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the Marines are poorly suited for their "peace-keeping" role in Lebanon. According to the congressional report, the Marines may have taken their diplomatic mission too literally. Geraghty, said the subcommittee, assumed that the Marines could not hide behind earthen walls or antitank trenches, because their "presence" required a high profile. Yet former U.S. Special Envoy Philip Habib testified that better defenses would not have "impaired the diplomatic mission." After the Navy shelled Druze positions in September, the subcommittee noted, the Marines were also slow to see that their perceived role was changing from symbolic peace keepers to pro-Gemayel combatants.

As they crouch in bunkers and nervously eye every moving vehicle, the Marines in Lebanon are now acutely aware of their vulnerability. But congressional investigators say that the Marine presence in Lebanon constitutes "a continuing invitation to attack by hostile forces." The Marines may learn soon enough if the terrorists decide to accept the invitation. Last week the Islamic Jihad organization, the group claiming responsibility for the bombing last Wednesday near a French military command post in Beirut, said it would strike again if the U.S. did not withdraw its forces within ten days.

—By Evan Thomas. Reported by Bruce van Voorst/Washington

Snowbelt to Sunbelt, the Big Chill

Winter strikes with the worst December in decades

Winter is not a season, it is an occupation," said City Maintenance Supervisor Mike Vazzano, who has spent the past 20 winters trying to keep the streets of Omaha clear of snow. He added meekly, "I really don't enjoy it that much." Last week Vazzano had real cause to complain: after 6 in. of snow, the temperature dropped to 24° below zero, a rec-

29° below, the lowest in 82 years. Power failures kept thousands shivering in the dark. Lander, Wyo. (pop. 7,867), was blacked out for twelve hours; owners of wood-burning stoves invited strangers in to share the warmth. Even the *Dynasty* crowd loosened up under the chill: at the exclusive annual Denver Debutante Ball, hardly an eyebrow was raised



Steam rises from a frozen Mississippi in Minneapolis, where temperatures fell to -29° F

ord for that day. That was only one of the 70 low-temperature records broken from Washington State to Illinois on Thursday, the first official day of winter, as an arctic front swept in the coldest stretch of December weather in more than 50 years.

By week's end readings had gone as low as a heart-stopping -55° in Wisdom, Mont. Even the Sunbelt shivered. "This is the worst ice storm I've seen in years," said Fort Worth Policeman Henry Green, as the city froze over. "And I've seen some doozies."

In addition to the travails it caused travelers and shoppers, the cold carried with it a familiar deadly toll. In Grandview, Texas, an eight-year-old child died in a fire when her mother tried to use the kitchen stove as a heater. In Seattle, a bus driver collapsed and died while trying to shovel sand under his snow-locked bus. In all, more than 140 people died, victims in one way or another of the unusually bitter December.

The Great Plains and the Midwest were hit hardest by the air mass that rolled in from Canada. In Big Timber, Mont., the wind chill factor (a combination of 15-m.p.h. winds and temperatures of 40 below zero) made it feel as if it were -85°. In Minneapolis, the mercury fell to



Cold ears in Minnesota



Frozen nose in Denver

when the cellist put a down jacket on over his tuxedo to play. In Sioux Falls, S. Dak., the A.A.A. was so swamped with pleas from stranded motorists that it was forced to take phones off the hook for three hours, only the third time it had done so in 15 years.

In Texas, 17,000 passengers were stranded at the Dallas-Fort Worth airport after three planes skidded off the icy runway. Police reported more than 100 jackknifed tractor trailers, and by midweek the city of Dallas, where the temperature dropped to 11°, had come to a virtual standstill as government offices and businesses stayed closed. "I'm a native Texan, and this weather has just bamboozled me," said Welder Bobby Labar.

The National Weather Service in Washington, D.C., offers cautious consolation to those fearful of the months to come. "You would have to go back to the winter of 1977 to see one outbreak after another of record-breaking temperatures," said Long-Range Forecaster Donald Gilman. "The odds are against it." But a Chicago department-store sales clerk has her own fatalistic interpretation of the abnormally cold weather: "This is the payback for the little baby winter we had last year."

Nation



Players and more players jam the Morongo tribe's Indian Village Bingo hall in California

Indian War Cry: Bingo!

Very few reservations about a coast-to-coast gambling boom

As they leave Los Angeles, the rush-hour drivers heading for the town of Banning (pop. 14,000) 85 miles away are indistinguishable from the great herd of Interstate 10 commuters, all driving toward the desert with the setting sun in their rear-view mirrors. But by the San Geronimo Pass, most of the working stiffs are home, and the chartered buses and four-door sedans start bunching up. By the time they reach the 32,000-acre Morongo Indian reservation, the hundreds of small-time gamblers form a ragtag convoy. Their destination is Indian Village Bingo, a new gambling hall with 1,400 seats that has teemed with players every night since it opened in April.

The conventional drowsy drone of the Indian-run bingo game is not so different from that played in church basements and lodge halls all over California and the U.S. But it is certainly more lucrative: Indian reservations like the Morongos are not subject to most civil regulatory laws—including the California provision that limits bingo jackpots to a measly \$250. Thus Indian Village Bingo offers an average total nightly payoff of \$20,000 and a jackpot that last week reached \$48,000. Thirty-five of the Morongo Indians have been provided jobs; near by, the Barona tribe's bingo game has earned \$300,000 in nine months.

Such tales have spread fast among the country's 1.4 million Indians, most of whom are poor, many destitute. At least 50 of the 167 reservation tribes, from the 8,000 Cherokee in North Carolina to the 1,200 Yaquis in Arizona, are trying to cash in on the quirky boom. In two weeks a new 1,600-seat hall will open on the Sandia Pueblo reservation in New Mexico, and the Baronas plan to build a \$2.5 million arena with room for 2,000. "Bingo is bene-

fitting our people," says Arthur Welmas, the Cabazon's tribal chairman. "It's giving us pride." The tribe's business manager, John Paul Nichols, is blunt. Says he: "We have ourselves a little gold mine."

Among the first Indian entrepreneurs to tap the lode were Maine's Penobscots, in 1976. Their reservation games were modest, run only on Sundays. The last was just before Thanksgiving: Maine authorities have managed to cut the high-stakes jackpots (from up to \$5,000 a game to \$200) because the Penobscots agreed in 1980 not to be treated as a sovereign reservation. Officials in Washington State, Arizona and Oklahoma are now trying to control Indian games. However, federal appellate courts ruled as recently as 1982 that if a state allows any bingo gambling—and 42 do—then it has no authority to regulate the way that Indians run bingo on their reservations.

The money and jobs are manna to many Indians. Cherokee of North Carolina have cleared \$500,000 in profits from the 65,000 players who have come since 1982 to their parlor in a converted textile mill. In Florida, where the Seminoles began bingo in 1979, the 1,800-member tribe this year raked in \$4.2 million from three joints. "We used to make trinkets," says Tribal Chairman James Billie, a former professional alligator wrestler, "but we didn't really have the marketing skills to make a go of that."

While the Bureau of Indian Affairs in

Washington might not have chosen bingo as a means to the native American dream, the Reagan Administration has reacted with benign neglect. Indeed, the enthusiasts among Indians sound like Reagan Republicans. "If anyone here is not working today," claims Barona Tribal Chairman Joe Welch, "it's because they don't want to."

Some tribes have handled their windfalls with surpassing prudence. The 185 Shakopee Sioux around Prior Lake, Minn., opened a 1,300-seat place just over a year ago. Already the bingo profits, \$2.5 million, have paid for new medical clinics, a day care program and an 85-foot-high tepee-cultural center. The Seminoles have endowed tribal scholarships, set up a credit union and amassed a large cattle herd. There is some populist pressure for cash distribution. The Baronas early this month gave members of the tribe \$1,000 apiece from bingo earnings; the money might have been better spent on repairing their reservation water system.

Tribes generally hire outside firms, some less than blue chip, to help run their bingo gaming. The usual fee is 45% of profits. There are some extravagantly bad deals: some Morongos, for instance, were given microwave ovens and video games, but get only 5% of any profits over \$500,000. A bill introduced in Congress by Arizona Democrat Morris Udall would require BIA scrutiny of all Indian bingo-management deals.

Some opposition is simply competitive. In Maine, says Penobscot Tribal Governor Timothy Love, state officials

"looked the other way until the Elks, the V.F.W. and the Knights of Columbus all started ranting and raving about us." Not far from the Barona reservation in California, Lemongrove V.F.W. Officer W. Happy Blake says his bingo take has withered by 75%. "I'm still holding on, but just barely."

American Indians have been holding on, just barely, for a century. The U.S., meanwhile, has not helped them toward self-reliance, but practically encouraged a Government dependence that the bingo businesses, here and there, are helping tribes to break. Tim Giago, who publishes the Lakota Times, an Indian newspaper, is understandably ambivalent about the cinder-block-and-tin palaces springing up on reservations. "We've got to find a means to survive," he says, "but I don't see our young people making any great strides working in casinos. This is O.K. as a stopgap, but why should we have to resort to this?" —By Kurt Andersen. Reported by Don Winbush/Chicago and Richard Woodbury/Los Angeles, with other bureaus



Seminole caller picking a number

Three Minutes

Scientists move up doomsday

The "doomsday clock" was created by a group of nuclear scientists to show graphically how close they believe the world is to a nuclear holocaust. Last week the monthly *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, on the advice of 47 scientists (including 18 Nobel prizewinners), set the clock forward one minute, at three minutes before midnight. That is the closest in 30 years.

The *Bulletin's* doomsday clock was first set at seven minutes before midnight in 1947. The clock has moved as close as two minutes before midnight (in 1953, when the Soviets detonated their first hydrogen bomb) and as far away as twelve minutes (most recently in 1972, when the U.S. and U.S.S.R. signed the SALT I, the arms-limitation agreement).

The clock

The latest uptick comes because arms-control talks have broken down and the arms race is intensifying. "It is not only a question of the numbers of nuclear weapons," wrote the *Bulletin's* editor in chief, Bernard Feld. "More ominous is the inclination of the leaders of the nuclear powers to talk and act as though they were prepared to use these weapons." ■

Too Much

Cementing a deal

The episode smacked of suspense fiction: forgery, smuggling, government agents, state-of-the-art electronics, a Moscow address. But it also had an all-American punch line.

Last January, Teledyne Geotech Inc. got an order for one of its \$114,000 seismometers, which are used to measure the force of nuclear blasts. Officials made a routine check of the number on the export license submitted by the would-be buyer, a Colorado company that wanted to ship the device to West Germany. U.S. Customs in Washington confirmed that the document was a fake. Agents began watching the officers of the Denver concern, Norman Cornerford and Bruce Adamski, who had ordered a \$54,000 krypton laser from another manufacturer. That device, used to etch computer microchips, was also bound for West Germany.

Customs agents suspected the real buyer: the Soviets. Aided by West German customs officials, they found a manifest for the laser with a most incriminating address: a physics lab in Moscow. Cornerford and Adamski, charged last week, each face up to seven years in prison. Frankish federal agents decided to send along the Soviet-bound parcels—sort of. They filled the crates with 700 lbs. of concrete and, inside one, tucked a two-word note, in plainest English: "F— you!" ■

The Presidency/Hugh Sidey

The Legacy of 1783

In the Old Senate Chamber of the Annapolis State House last Friday, General George Washington, after nearly nine years as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army, resigned his military commission before Congress. It was an emotional moment. By voluntarily yielding martial authority, Washington authenticated the American experiment in democracy and citizen government.

Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe watched. The delegates there from the states kept their hats on to demonstrate civil ascendancy. Washington's farewell took about three minutes and the response from Thomas Mifflin, president of Congress, was just as brief. A snowstorm was on the way and Washington, his saddlebags packed with presents for the children at Mount Vernon, wanted to be home on Christmas Eve for the season of peace on earth. Seven years of war were over at last.

This was, of course, a re-enactment of what happened 200 years ago. It was painstakingly faithful, except that Roger Mudd was on hand to narrate the proceedings for public television. Washington was played by New York Actor Jan Leighton, a remarkable look-alike. Maryland's Governor William Paca was represented by Maryland's current Governor Harry Hughes, no personal resemblance intended.

The pageant was a fitting close for 1983, a year that in some ways was more of a bi-centennial for the U.S. than 1976, which was so grandly celebrated. In 1783 John Adams, Benjamin Franklin and John Jay signed the Treaty of Paris, which they had negotiated in months of close bargaining. The treaty brought true peace and launched this nation as a recognized member of the global community.

For this entire year a band of treaty enthusiasts has traveled from Paris to San Francisco conducting small celebrations to remind as many people as possible about the legacy of 1783. None has been more dedicated than Joan Challinor, a Washington historian, who served as chairwoman of the National Committee for the Bicentennial of the Treaty of Paris. She appeared in Boston's Old North Church to talk to the faithful. She took a ride above Utah in a hot-air balloon dubbed *The Treaty of Paris*, the connection being that this is also the bicentennial of manned flight, an epic event that occurred in Paris and was witnessed by Benjamin Franklin. Challinor climbed to the daunting heights of the pulpit of St. Paul's Cathedral in London to inspire 2,000 British and U.S. citizens who are likewise determined, as Challinor said, "to rescue the Treaty of Paris from its undeserved obscurity."

As her long journey with the treaty winds down, Challinor believes that the message from that document and from the men who devised it has an eerie resonance at a time when we have grown weary of the threat of war, of arming and then arming more. "A recognition of the talents necessary for the work of peace and a rightful regard for the skills of international diplomacy seem a most appropriate commemoration of the Treaty of Paris," she says.

In 1783 the U.S., out of money and desire to fight, needed peace. The men in Paris understood that, and also understood the workings of the rest of the world. In a brilliant bit of negotiating, they produced a document that acknowledged U.S. independence and title to vast territories stretching to the Mississippi River without rupturing the special relationship between the people of the U.S. and the British Empire. "The fortunes of the new nation may have turned more on what they accomplished at the negotiating table than on all their other attainments," says Challinor. "We should put negotiators on an equal footing with our martial heroes, and diplomats should take their place beside generals and admirals in our pantheon. We should let the world know that we are about the work of peace as we were once about the work of war."

Citizen Washington, back home in Mount Vernon for Christmas, could not have said it better.



Washington's resignation by John Trumbull

Economy & Business

Cheers for a Banner Year

As growth surges and inflation stays low, companies slim down and shape up

For the first time in a long time, Americans will be able to toast the new year with the feeling that it will bring greater prosperity and brighter prospects. With unemployment falling, incomes rising, inflation at bay and shoppers crowding into stores, the economy is entering 1984 on a roll rather than in a rut. Looking back, businessmen and consumers can celebrate 1983 as a year of rebound and turnaround. For many industries and labor unions, it was also a year of transition and turmoil that will perma-

last 15 years ago. But the President was too pleased with the results to worry much about whether his policies were considered Keynesian, monetarist, supply side or all of the above. Said Reagan in an October speech: "You know that the best clue that our program is working is our critics don't call it Reaganomics any more."

Much of the credit for the recovery, however, belongs to Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul Volcker. After squeezing the money supply enough to re-

public criticism aimed at Volcker, who had often been accused of bringing on the recession to tame inflation. He stopped receiving two-by-fours in the mail from homebuilders protesting his policies. In a congressional hearing, Republican Senator John Heinz of Pennsylvania told Volcker that "the only things I can think of that you haven't been blamed for are herpes and giving up the Panama Canal." But the Senator added, "We're lucky to have you as chairman."

Volcker's term in office was scheduled to end in August, and the question of whether Reagan would reappoint the chairman generated more excitement and suspense than Billy Martin's fate as manager of the New York Yankees. For a while, Presidential Counsellor Edwin Meese and Treasury Secretary Donald Regan urged Reagan to choose his own man to replace Volcker, a Carter appointee. The anti-Volcker group, though, never came up with a serious candidate, and the business community rallied around the chairman because of his record as an inflation fighter. Finally on June 18 the President interrupted a radio address with what he called a news flash: "Give me the city desk. I've got a story that'll crack this town wide open! ... I have asked Chairman Paul Volcker to accept reappointment."

The hoopla surrounding Volcker's nomination heightened his status as the staid financial community's first superstar. At his congressional confirmation hearing, so many lawmakers, reporters and visitors were eager to hear the chairman that the session had to be moved from the Senate Banking Committee hearing room to the huge Caucus Room, where Senators had once interrogated the Watergate conspirators. Yet despite his power and prestige, Volcker retains his austere personal style. He still lives in a cubbyhole apartment near his office, buys cheap cigars from colleagues and brags about his watch, which looks exactly like a \$1,500 Rolex but cost him only \$60.

In their battle against inflation, Reagan and Volcker had good fortune on their side. With the world awash in an oversupply of oil, the once mighty Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries could no longer dictate the cost of crude. The group's new powerlessness moved Mani Saïd al-Oteiba, Oil Minister of the United Arab Emirates, to compose a doleful poem that began:



nently reshape the economic landscape. Serious threats to growth remain, most notably the ballooning federal deficit and the formidable challenge of foreign competition. Nonetheless, millions of revelers will ring out 1983 this weekend with a rousing and heartfelt cheer.

The year marked the centennial of the birth of John Maynard Keynes, and the tonic that jolted the U.S. out of recession was just what the famed economist might have prescribed: easier money, lower taxes and heavy Government spending. Ironically, the chief architect of the recovery had never been known as a disciple of Keynes'. Ronald Reagan came to the White House pledging to balance the budget and trim the size of Government. Instead, his Administration ran up a fiscal 1983 deficit of \$195.4 billion, which is more than the entire budget was

duce inflation from 12.4% in 1980 to 3.9% in 1982, the central bank eased up considerably in the last half of 1982 and early 1983. The change in policy helped push down the prime rate that banks charge for corporate loans, from 16.5% to 10.5%, and triggered an economic upturn last spring that was much brisker than expected. From April through September, the gross national product, adjusted for inflation, expanded at an 8.6% annual pace. The economy was so exuberant, in fact, that the Reserve Board decided to tighten slightly in late spring, and the prime rate later rose a notch, to 11%. Government figures released last week showed that G.N.P. growth slowed to a more sustainable 4.5% pace in the fourth quarter and that consumer prices rose in November at a modest 3.6% annual rate.

The recovery defused much of the

I am truly troubled and with OPEC distressed.

*OPEC's major crisis is no longer suppressed,
The market is stagnant, the price
of crude oil depressed.*

In January a rancorous OPEC session in Geneva broke up before agreement could be reached on a pricing strategy, and the group seemed on the verge of disintegration. Within three weeks, a price war erupted, led by Britain and Norway, two non-OPEC producers, and Nigeria, an OPEC member. Finally in March, after a twelve-day session in London, the bickering band of OPEC ministers agreed to slash their bench-mark oil price from \$34 per bbl. to \$29, the first cut in the group's 23-year history.

The dip in petroleum prices and the sharp drop in U.S. interest rates helped ease pressure on many developing nations that are struggling under enormous and dangerous debt loads, but their finances remain shaky. Two weeks ago, the new government of Argentina requested a six-month grace period for interest payments on its \$40 billion debt. A team of bankers and troubleshooters from the International Monetary Fund approved a \$10 billion emergency loan package in November that once again saved Brazil from defaulting on its \$91 billion debt, but the country's economy is deeply depressed and has been plagued all year by strikes, demonstrations, riots and looting. As a major petroleum exporter, Mexico was hurt by the oil price decline. Nonetheless, it is managing to keep up with interest payments on its \$88 billion in foreign loans.

After an uncharacteristically sluggish 1982, the dynamic economies of the Pacific region surged again in 1983. The U.S. recovery allowed South Korea, Singapore and Taiwan to boost exports and achieve growth rates in the 6%-to-9% range. Japan's economy grew at a more modest 3.5% pace, but the government unveiled a program to spur consumer demand with tax cuts and new public works spending.

Western Europe's rebound has been painfully slow. The ten nations of the European Community have had an average 1983 growth rate of about 1%, and unemployment hovers at 10.5%. Aftershocks of the recession are still shaking confidence. West Germany's banking system was rocked in November by the collapse of IBH Holding, a giant construction equipment manufacturer that was an estimated \$300 million in debt. Hellenic Lines, the largest Greek cargo-shipping company, filed a bankruptcy petition this month, after defaulting on an \$80 million credit line from U.S. and European banks.

In the U.S., some of the biggest stories were bankruptcies that never happened. International Harvester, the ailing farm-equipment manufacturer that many on Wall Street had given up for dead, limped through the year. The company said this month that its 200 creditors had agreed to a \$3.5 billion debt-restructuring plan that gives the firm hope for survival.


Chrysler moved off the critical list and earned a \$582.6 million profit for the first nine months of the year. No one better symbolized the determination of American businessmen to turn things around than Chrysler Chairman Lee Iacocca. He saved the third largest U.S. auto company by revamping its product line, trimming and modernizing its operations and gaining wage concessions from workers. In August Chrysler roared past a milestone by repaying, seven years ahead of schedule, the last of the \$1.2 billion in federally guaranteed loans it had received as part of the bailout plan that Congress passed in 1979. Beamed Iacocca: "We at Chrysler borrow money the old-fashioned way. We pay it back."

Chrysler's survival tactics dramatized several trends that have been transforming the U.S. economy. Pressed by foreign competition, such smokestack industries as autos, steel and rubber have been closing inefficient plants, thinning out their work forces and relying more heavily on state-of-the-art technology and automa-

steel companies lost \$1.668 billion in the first nine months of the year. With 250,000 members on layoff, the United Steelworkers has felt as if it were pinned under an I beam. In March the union took a 9% pay cut, but that did not satisfy management. U.S. Steel threatened this month to shut down five plants, either partially or completely, unless employees accept further contract concessions.

While putting a squeeze on workers, the steel companies continued their campaign in Washington for greater protection from imports, which have captured 19.6% of the American market. Though Western Europe and Japan have curbed their steel exports to the U.S., a new wave of shipments is flowing in from Brazil, South Korea and Mexico. Steel executives argue that these exports are subsidized by foreign governments and that the U.S. should retaliate with import quotas.

In its rhetoric, the Administration rejected protectionism. Declared Reagan: "We and our trading partners are in the same boat. If one partner shoots a hole in



tion. Employment levels in these old-line fields will probably never return to pre-recession levels. Future job growth will increasingly be concentrated in such service sectors as health care and the restaurant business, rather than in manufacturing.

As companies tried to reduce costs in 1983, labor unions lost clout and suffered pay cuts. For some 20,000 packing-house employees who are members of the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union, the average hourly wage dropped from more than \$10 to about \$8. Said Union Official Lewie Anderson: "Workers haven't taken this bad a beating since before 1935." Greyhound employees staged a bitter seven-week strike against the bus line. In the end, the workers agreed last week to a 7.8% wage cut.

Steel was the sickest of the smokestack industries. Despite the recovery,

the bottom of the boat, does it make sense for the other partner to shoot another hole? There are those who say yes and call it getting tough. I call it getting wet." In practice, however, the White House too often bowed to pressure for import barriers. The Government hiked the tariff on heavyweight motorcycles from 4.4% to 49.4% to shield the last U.S. manufacturer, Harley-Davidson, and imposed tighter import controls on textiles.

The U.S. airline industry went through some of its most turbulent times in 1983. Spawed by the beginning of deregulation in 1978, cut-rate, nonunion carriers like People Express triggered fare wars and shot down the profits of the nine major airlines, which lost \$71.8 million in the first nine months of the year. Frank Lorenzo, who was one of the pioneers of discount air travel as head of Texas Inter-

Economy & Business



national and New York Air, came up with a controversial approach to cost cutting after taking over unionized, money-losing Continental Airlines. In September he grounded all domestic flights, filed for reorganization under the bankruptcy laws, put two-thirds of the 12,000 employees on "inactive status," and started up service again with workers willing to accept as little as half the wages that Continental employees had been making. Lorenzo said that his maneuver would give Continental an "opportunity to compete." Some critics called it union busting. After Eastern Airlines Chairman Frank Borman warned that his carrier might follow Continental into bankruptcy proceedings, his major unions agreed to pay reductions and work-rule changes worth \$367 million. In return, workers will get 15 million shares of Eastern stock and control two seats on the airline's board.

While many industries were shaking off the recession, the electronics business continued to boom. Americans bought an estimated 4 million video-cassette recorders, up 97% from 1982, and 6.7 million personal computers, up 109%. California's legendary Silicon Valley, however, fell under the shadow of a colossus. Invincible IBM grabbed the lead in personal computer sales from Apple Computer, the young Silicon Valley firm that had been the industry's pacesetter. In just five months the price of Apple's shares plunged from \$63 to \$17. Another former Valley highflyer, Osborne Computer, filed for bankruptcy after its portable machines encountered stiff competition from such firms as Kaypro of Solano Beach, Calif., and Houston-based Compaq. Atari and Mattel suffered huge losses because of sluggish sales and fierce price-cutting as the video-game bubble burst.

No business was more beset by change and uncertainty than the telecommunications industry, which is anxiously awaiting the breakup of A T & T on New

Year's Day. Telephone equipment manufacturers were eager to get a crack at selling to the seven new regional Bell companies, while computer firms were wondering if A T & T would be a formidable invader of their turf. Many consumers were bewildered. Fretted Dorothea White, 86, a widow living alone in Los Angeles: "I don't really see why they had to break up A T & T. It was a good system, and it seemed to be working." People questioned whether proposed cuts in long-distance rates would offset expected jumps in the cost of local service.

While preparing to spin off much of the Bell System, A T & T has been moving to expand its business overseas. It is taking part in joint ventures to make and market telecommunications equipment with Philips, the diversified Dutch company, and to manufacture electronic circuits with Gold Star Semiconductor of South Korea. In addition, A T & T announced last week that it was buying a

25% stake in Olivetti, the Italian office-equipment maker, for \$260 million. In this new partnership, A T & T will gain a European distribution network for its products, while Olivetti will be able to use some of the technology developed by A T & T's Bell Laboratories.

As the U.S. recovery wound up its first year, some economists were already raising doubts about the upturn's ultimate strength and durability. Among them was Martin Feldstein, the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, who said that huge budget deficits might push up interest rates and produce a "lopsided recovery that would be slower paced and more fragile than a balanced recovery." He repeatedly warned that taxes might have to be raised.

Other Administration officials, however, brushed aside and even ridiculed Feldstein's concerns. Said Treasury Secretary Donald Regan: "I wish economists would sit back and relax. This will be one of the greatest recoveries in history." At a press briefing in November, White House Press Secretary Larry Speakes told reporters that the President and Secretary Regan "obviously don't agree" with Feldstein. He also pointedly announced that Feldstein had been excluded that day from a White House economic policy luncheon. Told that Feldstein was, in fact, present at the session, Speakes quipped, "Maybe he won't make it to dessert."

The public rebuke fueled speculation that Feldstein might be on the way out. But the President later tried to downplay the incident and insisted that there were no substantial disagreements among Administration policymakers. Nonetheless, economists like Walter Heller, who served as chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, feared that Reagan was unwisely disregarding Feldstein's warnings about the need for a tax hike.

The controversy between the President and his chief economist was disturbingly reminiscent of the dispute in 1966 between President Johnson and his Council of Economic Advisers. Council Chairman Gardner Ackley argued that taxes had to be raised to pay for the Viet Nam War, but Johnson would not hear of it. He later changed his mind and signed a tax-increase bill in 1968, but the delay was a costly mistake. Many economists believe it helped unleash the inflationary spiral that U.S. policymakers have been battling ever since.

Fears of future inflation and monstrous budget deficits were not enough, however, to dispel the public mood of relief and confidence that prevailed as 1983 was drawing to a close. For many people, the most pressing concern at the moment was how to fight past the mobs crowding into shopping malls during the best Christmas season in years. The recovery was rolling, and Americans were ready to enjoy it.

—By Charles P. Alexander



Bonus Babies

Profitability has its rewards

The 950 employees of Shaklee, a San Francisco health-food manufacturer, stood and applauded early this month when they heard about their upcoming Christmas presents. Chairman J. Gary Shansby announced that the year-end bonuses would be boosted from the 5.5% of their salaries that was paid last year to 12%. Said Personnel Director Al Cotton: "They were ecstatic."

Many U.S. companies have been giving out similar good news in recent weeks. Following three years of recession, bonuses are back with a bang. After-tax corporate profits in 1983 will reach some \$130 billion, an increase of almost 14% from 1982, and many firms are passing along the good times in the form of higher bonuses. About 60% of the corporations surveyed by Prentice-Hall publishers plan this year to give some type of year-end premium, ranging from cash to food baskets. About one-third of the companies will give a bigger present than last year.

At some firms, the bonuses are surprisingly sweeping and generous. The Chicago-based Leo Burnett advertising agency gave all 1,600 of its U.S. employees a "profit-participation cash bonus."

Said one Burnett executive: "It was a good deal better than last year's. I haven't detected a single sign of disappointment." At Silicon Valley's Hewlett-Packard, supervisors ceremoniously handed out checks to 62,500 employees for two weeks' extra pay, just in time for Christmas shopping. To qualify, employees needed at least six months on the job. The total bonus came to \$49 million, up slightly from last year. Said Spokeswoman Karen Jervais: "Keeping costs down and profits up means bigger bonuses. If employees work really hard, they are going to share in the success of the company."

Some of the most bountiful bonuses are on Wall Street, where investment companies this year reaped record earnings from another bull market in stocks. At the Drexel Burnham Lambert brokerage firm, executive officers can earn bonuses equal to as much as three years' salary. Other employees, with at least ten years on the job, are entitled to a gift of up to 20 weeks' pay. Last year the maximum was 13 weeks' worth. Even employees who have been with the company only six months are eligible for up to three weeks' extra wages. "Everybody from the janitor to the chairman receives them," says Drexel Chairman Robert Linton. "We want to spread the wealth around."

Detroit automakers did not have bonuses under their Christmas trees, but big ones are on the way. Beginning this spring, the Big Three automakers will

give executives their first bonus checks since 1979. General Motors, Ford and Chrysler expect record total profits of about \$6.5 billion in 1983, a more than 13-fold increase from \$475 million in 1982. At present, many auto executives are taking home less than they earned five years ago. GM Chairman Roger Smith, for example, made \$548,634 last year, compared with a salary of \$240,000 and a bonus of \$590,000 in 1978, when he was an executive vice president. But in early spring, Smith is likely to be the first GM executive in history to break the \$1 million barrier in salary and bonus. GM's compensation committee will have more than \$100 million in 1983 bonuses to divide among 5,000 executives.

Despite the general trend to more year-end payoffs, some firms have cut back because they feel strapped by lingering effects of the recession. San Diego-based Pacific Southwest Airlines canceled its annual Christmas time circus-in-a-hangar this year as an austerity measure.

Instead, the airline distributed \$15 gift certificates that could be used to purchase a turkey.

Many large firms like Shearson/American Express have rejected holiday gift giving as condescending and unrelated to job performance. They prefer to reward workers with larger salaries or with profit-sharing plans. But the tradition thrives at companies where managers carry on a more personal relationship with workers. Says Los Angeles Management Consultant Louis Howe: "At small companies, where there continues to be a close identification between employer and employees, the Christmas bonus never went out of favor."

The gifts come in many packages. The Northrop aviation firm lets its 24,000 California workers have two weeks off with pay. New York City's Apple Bank gave its 540 workers cash bonuses that were 7% bigger than last year's and distributed baskets, each containing a turkey, ham, cheese, candy and other treats.

In a survey of 425 companies by the Washington-based Bureau of National Affairs, half of the firms said they were throwing Christmas parties, up from about 40% last year. At a holiday bash sponsored by the Gerber baby-food firm in Fremont, Mich., a magician provided entertainment and the company Santa Claus helped give out more than 1,000 toys to children of employees.

Last year, even with the economy sagging, Toys R Us Chairman Charles Lazarus won a bonus of \$1.1 million on top of his \$315,000 salary. Norman Ricken, the president of the New Jersey-based chain, got a check for \$320,000. With this Christmas season's riotous demand for products ranging from Cabbage Patch dolls to *Return of the Jedi* action figures, Toys R Us executives can probably count on bonuses that will buy plenty of grownup playthings. ■

Green Light

The GM-Toyota deal rolls on

It was anything but a modest proposal. General Motors, the world's largest automaker, would hook up with Toyota, the No. 3, to build some 200,000 small cars a year in a now closed Chevrolet plant outside San Francisco. When it was announced last February, the plan provoked cries of alarm from rival car manufacturers and set off an intensive Federal Trade Commission review. Last week, after GM and Toyota signed an agreement stating that they would abide by U.S. anti-trust laws, the FTC gave the green light to the venture.

The agency's 3-2 vote, which will become final after a 60-day period for public comment, opens the way for the partners to begin producing the cars late next fall. Experts look for the new auto, already dubbed the Toyolet by Detroit wags, to resemble Toyota's redesigned 1984 Corolla, which sells for some \$7,000.

The new venture will strengthen GM's position in the small-car field, where it has been glaringly weak. Although U.S. automakers have been trying since the late 1970s to assemble a model that can compete profitably with economy-size imports, they have been largely unsuccessful. The Japanese currently build small cars for an average of some \$2,000 less than corresponding U.S. autos.

The prospect of GM's gaining access to Toyota's small-car know-how sent fear into the boardrooms of Ford, Chrysler and American Motors. GM already accounts for 60% of all U.S. sales of American-made cars, while Toyota has 25% of the market for imports. "I don't



The 1984 Corolla: a model for the Toyolet

care what kind of fig-leaf consent order they try to cover it up with," said Chrysler Chairman Lee Iacocca after last week's FTC decision. "It's not right, and I will do everything in my power to see that the American public gets a clear picture of just how wrong it is."

The FTC action, which permits the partners to build up to 250,000 autos a year, was also strongly opposed by Commissioners Michael Pertschuk and Patricia Bailey. Pertschuk called the venture "a classic anti-trust violation."

The GM-Toyota deal is expected to force other U.S. carmakers to race to make similar arrangements with Japanese firms. Some industry watchers are even predicting that it will not be long before virtually all small cars sold in the U.S. will be either built abroad or made from imported components. ■



World

JAPAN

A Big Shokku for Yasu

The Liberal Democrats just hang on

He is a polite Prime Minister. He is a humble Prime Minister. He is a grave and austere Prime Minister.

—Takao Fujinami, deputy secretary-general, Liberal Democratic Party

Above all, he is very lucky even to be Prime Minister. Pundits and polls alike had predicted a respectable victory for Yasuhiro Nakasone and his Liberal Democrats, so the news last week sent a *shokku* from the southern tip of Kyushu to northern Hokkaido. When the ballots were counted for the 511-member lower house of parliament, the L.D.P. had failed to win a majority, only the third time that has happened since the party came to power in 1955. Indeed, the Liberal Democrats' loss of 36 seats, from 286 to 250, was the largest they had ever suffered. Only by swiftly securing the support of nine independent deputies did Nakasone emerge with a perilously slim working majority of 259 seats. That should allow him to continue his domestic and foreign policies, albeit at a considerably slower pace.

The voters' rejection shocked no one so much as Nakasone, who is halfway through his two-year term as party leader. "It was a severe result for me," said the weary Prime Minister. "I have to take cautious steps."

The first of those steps was to quell unhappiness among the five often cantankerous political blocs that make up the L.D.P. As head of the party's fourth largest faction, Nakasone, 65, depends on the approval of fellow powerbrokers to stay on as both party leader and Prime Minister. Thus Nakasone devoted most of his energies last week to greeting delegation after delegation of supporters at his official residence in downtown Tokyo and venturing forth to the offices of L.D.P. leaders to pay his respects. Much of the time he was bargaining with his backers and appeasing his critics; throughout, the sometimes haughty Nakasone acted like a man transformed.

Those labors paid off. After the prom-




Amid glum party leaders, the Prime Minister discusses election results with reporters

ised to reform the party and eliminate the influence in it of tainted former Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka, the L.D.P. elders agreed to back Nakasone for Prime Minister when the new Diet convenes this week. But choosing a Cabinet and awarding committee posts will be more difficult and time consuming as each L.D.P. faction makes its deal with him in return for its support. Nakasone must then cope with the opposition. The Socialist Party, under its energetic new leader, Masashi Ishibashi, 59, strengthened its position as the main opposition party by picking up eleven seats, for a total of 112. In its best showing ever, the Komeito (Clean Government) Party won 58 seats, up from 31. The Democratic Socialists elected 38 deputies, a gain of six, while the New Liberal Club, an L.D.P. offshoot, lost two of its ten seats.

Ironically, one of the big winners was Tanaka, 65, leader of the largest faction within the L.D.P., whose bribery conviction last October had forced Nakasone to call the election. Despite the guilty verdict and opposition charges of "money poli-

Nakasone at tea ceremony on election day



tics," Tanaka's constituents in the northwestern prefecture of Niigata re-elected him with 221,000 votes, his most resounding victory since he first won the seat 36 years ago.

Once the new government is formed, Japan's domestic and foreign policies are not likely to change drastically. The Liberal Democrats' setback was traceable to a number of reasons: disgust over political corruption, a poor turnout, a lackadaisical campaign strategy. But disenchantment with Nakasone did not seem to have been a major factor. At home, the party will be forced to compromise more with the opposition, which favors larger tax cuts, greater welfare spending and smaller defense outlays than the Liberal Democrats. Foreign policy will stay on course. In Washington, the expectation is that the Prime Minister will still be willing to curb his country's exports, loosen import restrictions and boost Japan's defenses, although, given his slim majority, he will have to proceed more cautiously. For example, an agreement to allow greater imports of American beef and citrus products, once expected in early 1984, will now take longer to wrap up.

Nakasone had no choice but to hold the elections. In early October, after a 6½-year trial, Tanaka was found guilty of accepting a payoff of 500 million yen (about \$2.2 million at current exchange rates) from Lockheed Corp. in return for persuading the country's largest domestic airline, All Nippon Airways, to buy the firm's TriStar jets. Vowing to appeal, Tanaka refused to resign his Diet seat. When the L.D.P. blocked a resolution demanding Tanaka's ouster, opposition members boycotted Diet sessions. Faced with a parliamentary stalemate, Nakasone dissolved the lower house in late November.

Throughout the 15-day campaign, the opposition focused on Tanaka and the

whiff of corruption in high places. A Socialist poster showed a baseball umpire yelling ALMIGHTY MONEY POLITICS—OUT!, while the Buddhist-backed Komeito displayed placards reading CLEAN POLITICS. The L.D.P. generally evaded the issue with bland appeals for stability and patriotism. The opposition parties proved far more united than expected. In 58 of the country's 130 districts, for example, the main opposition groups fielded a joint candidate.

No one could fault Nakasone for not giving his all: wearing the white gloves that symbolize clean hands in Japanese politics, the Prime Minister made more than 100 campaign stops. On one especially hectic day, he pledged to cut taxes, raise wages, burnish Japan's image abroad and personally lead the search for a cancer cure. Lulled by the sunny polls, however, many other L.D.P. hopefuls campaigned sluggishly. The party, moreover, miscalculated by running too many candidates. Under the Japanese electoral system, a party can put up as many contenders as it likes in a district, which elects from three to five representatives each. In some areas, there were more Liberal Democrats running than there were seats, which served to split the L.D.P. vote and allow opposition candidates to squeeze into office.

Even the weather conspired against the ruling party, which was not as well organized to muster the vote as were the smaller groups, notably Komeito. Snow in the north and subzero temperatures elsewhere helped produce a dismal turnout of 68%, the lowest since World War II.

On election day, an optimistic Nakasone posed for pictures performing the traditional tea ceremony, then awaited results at his official residence in Tokyo. At party headquarters, smiles soon dissolved into frowns: returns from the countryside, where the L.D.P. is strongest, were not as favorable as expected. By the time the ballots from the cities had been



Tanaka voting in his home district . . .



... and Masashi Ishibashi, whose Socialist Party won 112 seats

counted Monday afternoon, the leaders knew the worst. Said Nakasone: "It was a great criticism from the people."

As it turned out, the popular vote was not so damning. The L.D.P. drew 45.8%, down from a record 47.9% in the last election in 1980 but still about the average percentage for the party over the past five elections. The Komeito picked up 10.1%,

only a slight improvement over its 1980 total of 9%, while the Socialists bettered their performance by an even smaller margin (19.5% to 19.3%). Nakasone, on the other hand, did not even come in first in his own Gumma prefecture, north of Tokyo: for the fifth straight election, he finished second in the three-seat district to former Prime Minister Takeo Fukuda, a rival L.D.P. boss.

The Prime Minister's first major test is likely to come from within his own party. The problem: how to handle Tanaka. While many L.D.P. members believe that Tanaka deserves blame for the party's poor showing, the "Shadow Shogun" lost little of his strength. His faction, now 62 members, lost only four seats, and his support is crucial if Nakasone is to remain in office. So far, Nakasone's only concrete concession to anti-Tanaka forces has been a promise to establish a political-ethics committee in the lower house. But since Tanaka insists that he will take his seat in the new Diet, pressures to deal with the problem could build in coming weeks. Says a Fukuda lieutenant: "We went into the campaign without solving the Tanaka question. We now have to decide within the party what to do about it."

At week's end, Nakasone issued a statement, approved by other L.D.P. leaders, in which he promised to "eliminate completely" Tanaka's influence in the party. The opposition dismissed the gesture as cosmetic. Yet even if Nakasone survives the political sharpshooting within his party, he still faces an election next November to retain the L.D.P. leadership. Last week's defeat may return to haunt him then—as Nakasone well knows. In 1979, when the L.D.P. lost only one seat, several members loudly demanded the resignation of then Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira. Among the most vociferous: Yasuhiro Nakasone.

—By James Kelly, Reported by Edwin M. Reingold/Tokyo and Barrett Seaman/Washington

Giving the "Banzzai!" sign, members of the Komeito (Clean Government) Party celebrate their gains in Tokyo



MIDDLE EAST

Reconciliation on the Nile

On the run again, Arafat turns up in Cairo to embrace Mubarak

"It proves that Egypt is always right," declared an excited Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak as he stood at the steps of Cairo's Kubbeh Palace awaiting the arrival of a surprise visitor. His guest: Palestine Liberation Organization Chairman Yasser Arafat, who had shunned Egypt ever since Mubarak's predecessor, the late Anwar Sadat, took his search for peace to Jerusalem in 1977 and subsequently signed a peace treaty with Israel. Now, in one of those strange, unpredictable moments of diplomatic fluidity in the Middle East, alignments seemed to be shifting once more.

Scarcely 48 hours earlier, Arafat and

A rapprochement with Cairo, which had been isolated in the Arab world since the Sadat peace initiative, could lead to stronger ties between Arafat's segment of the P.L.O. and the moderate governments of Saudi Arabia and Jordan. It might even bring about a resumption of discussions between Arafat and Jordan's King Hussein to determine a common front in future negotiations with Israel based on President Reagan's 1982 peace initiative. That plan called for an eventual link between Jordan and the West Bank and Gaza, the territories Israel has occupied since 1967.

For Mubarak, the encounter with



Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak greets P.L.O. Chairman Yasser Arafat in Cairo

In one of those moments of diplomatic fluidity, alignments seemed to be shifting once more.

about 4,000 of his loyalist forces had been evacuated from the northern Lebanese port city of Tripoli, where they had been besieged by Syrian-backed P.L.O. rebels and shelled by Israeli naval guns. The ever flexible Arafat quickly looked for new support—and appeared to find it in Cairo. As he arrived by helicopter from Issmailia on the Suez Canal, the P.L.O. chairman received a warm embrace from Mubarak. Later, after a conversation that lasted almost two hours, Mubarak hailed his guest as a "moderate leader of the Palestinian people." Arafat, for his part, expressed the hope that one day he and Mubarak would be able to pray together at the Al Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem.

The unexpectedly warm encounter—some Middle East experts called it a "historic meeting"—had significance for both men. For Arafat it was a gamble, but also something of a diplomatic coup, coming so quickly after the expulsion from Tripoli.

Arafat was a step toward an Egyptian reconciliation with much of the Arab world. Palestinian hard-liners called Arafat's move "treason," and Syria denounced him as "the new Sadat," but Arab moderates were delighted. As further indication that the Arabs' isolation of Egypt is ending, Jordan said that it would resume full-scale trading with Egypt for the first time in five years.

The U.S. responded favorably as well, characterizing the Mubarak-Arafat meeting as "an encouraging development." That angered the government of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, which insisted that the encounter in Cairo was a breach of the spirit of Camp David. In a frosty, hour-long meeting with Undersecretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger and Richard Murphy, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Israel's Ambassador to Washington, Meir Rosenne, protested that Camp David en-

joined the Egyptians from encouraging terrorism and thus from dealing with the likes of Arafat. Eagleburger replied that the U.S. saw the rapprochement as an opportunity to use Egyptian influence toward getting Arafat and Hussein to cooperate in future peace negotiations.

In Lebanon, the bloodletting went on without pause. In an effort to strike at terrorist bases, Israeli planes twice raided positions held by Iranian-backed Shi'ite militiamen in eastern Lebanon. In Beirut, two more car bombs exploded. A pickup truck loaded with explosives blew up outside the French military command post in East Beirut, killing a French paratrooper and eight Lebanese civilians; a second blast shattered a West Beirut bar frequented by U.S. Marines assigned to guard the U.S. embassy. There were no U.S. casualties but one bystander was killed. A group calling itself Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility and warned that unless all "foreigners," particularly the U.S. and France, withdraw from Lebanon by Jan. 1, the terrorists will "make the earth shake beneath their feet."

For a while the Arafat evacuation from Tripoli also seemed in doubt. Five Greek ships had been chartered to take the P.L.O. forces out, under the protection of French naval vessels, including the aircraft carrier *Clemenceau*. The plan nearly collapsed when the Israelis made it clear, with their repeated gunboat bombardments of Tripoli, that they did not intend to let Arafat slip away unscathed—and maybe not at all. High-ranking sources in Jerusalem told TIME that the Israeli government had actually authorized special military and intelligence units to infiltrate Tripoli under the cover of the naval gunfire and assassinate the P.L.O. chairman. When it realized what the Israelis had in mind, according to these sources, the Reagan Administration intervened by insisting that the U.S. wanted the Palestinians removed from Tripoli without mishap. Only then did the Israelis stand down and allow the evacuation to proceed.

Soon after sunrise on the day of the evacuation, a small Lebanese boat circled the inner harbor, dropping sticks of dynamite to detonate any ordnance that the Israeli navy might have dropped in the basin during the previous day's firing. The Cypriot freighter *My Charm*, hit in that bombardment, was still ablaze. At 8:32 a.m., when the first Greek ship was sighted on the horizon, assembled Palestinian fighters broke into cheers and loosed volleys of small-arms fire into the air. They kept their personal weapons—pistols and rifles—as they fled onto the ships, but abandoned their heavy equipment. And they left behind at least 1,000 men, just as they had done during their forced withdrawal from Beirut 16 months earlier. "We are leaving Tripoli but we are not giving up the struggle," said Arafat. "No one has cut off our head, and we are not on our knees." Asked if he would resign as P.L.O. leader,

GOT PLAQUE? FIGHT BACK.

What is plaque?




Artist's rendition of bacterial plaque x 10,000 magnification.

You may not know it, but you could have plaque. Almost everybody does. Plaque is a sticky, nearly invisible germ film that forms and builds up on your teeth.

But, if you reduce plaque, you can have a cleaner, fresher mouth with less stain and odor.



How does Listerine® fight plaque?



Rinse full strength for 30 seconds morning and night.

You know Listerine kills the germs that can cause bad breath. Now recent tests prove that it



also kills the germs that can cause plaque buildup.

Reduce plaque buildup by up to 50%.

Clinical evidence shows that with a professional cleaning, regular brushing, and rinsing with Listerine twice a day, you can reduce plaque buildup by up to 50% for a cleaner mouth. And that means better oral hygiene.




Blue bar is plaque after regular brushing and rinsing with water; yellow bar is plaque after regular brushing and rinsing twice a day with Listerine. There's up to 50% less plaque with Listerine.



Make it part of your daily oral hygiene.

So, to reduce plaque, brush thoroughly—at least twice a day is recommended. Floss to remove food particles and plaque between teeth. See your dentist for cleanings and check-ups at least twice a year. And use Listerine Antiseptic regularly, twice a day, for better oral hygiene.



Listerine. Helps reduce plaque for better oral hygiene.

Today's Chevrolet

Cavalier. The hottest-selling has a cool, low price.

Chevy Cavalier. The hottest-selling Chevrolet for a lot of good reasons. Hottest-selling because of some of the most advanced design and engineering you'll find on a front-drive car today. Hottest-selling because of high-level fit and finish, thanks to dedicated workers using computerized robots and lasers. Hottest-selling because Cavalier offers more horsepower and more sedan room than the three top-selling imports. Hottest-selling because of a cool, low price.

Hot-selling performance. Cavalier goes with a high-compression, electronically fuel-injected 2.0-liter engine with an on-board computer that constantly fine-tunes your engine while you drive.

Upbeat style. Cavalier is putting the heat on the competition with new front-end styling which makes its clean wedge shape even cleaner looking. And Cavalier's handsome interior is laid out in a fashion that allows you to drive comfortably and enjoy the challenges of the road.

All at a cool, low price. Best of all, Cavalier gives you all this at a low Chevrolet price. So if you're looking for enlightened thinking and a low price in a responsive, fun-to-drive automobile, grab a hot-selling Chevrolet Cavalier. Today's Chevrolet. Bringing you the cars and trucks you want and need. That's what Taking Charge is all about.



OFFICIAL U.S.
CARS AND TRUCKS
OF THE XIV
OLYMPIC WINTER
GAMES

Sarajevo '84
© 1983 GM Corp. Sarajevo '84

Some Chevrolets are equipped with engines produced by other GM divisions, subsidiaries, or affiliated companies worldwide. See your dealer for details.



Let's get it together.
Buckle up.

Chevrolet



CHEVROLET 
taking charge

Warning: The Surgeon General Has Determined
That Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Your Health.

ULTRA LIGHTS: 6 mg. "tar", 0.5 mg. nicotine av. per cigarette by FTC method,
FILTER: 9 mg. "tar", 0.7 mg. nicotine av. per cigarette, FTC Report MAR. '83.

VANTAGE.
THE TASTE OF SUCCESS.

Great Taste
with Low Tar.
That's Success!



World

as his enemies were demanding, Arafat replied, "I resign only when I am dead."

In Kuwait, meanwhile, the government arrested ten Muslim fundamentalists in connection with six terror bomb explosions that killed six people and damaged the American and French embassies two weeks ago. All were said to be members of Al Dawaa, an underground Iraqi Shi'ite party closely linked to Iran. Israeli intelligence sources told TIME Correspondent David Halevy in Jerusalem that there was evidence that the order for the Kuwait bombings had come directly from the Iranian government. The explosives, said the sources, had been smuggled into Kuwait from Iraq in a secret compartment on an oil truck and were delivered to a Kuwaiti Shi'ite of Lebanese origin, who built and prepared the car bombs. The details, the Israelis said, were further proof of a growing Iranian-directed terror network whose activities are being felt as far to the west as NATO bases in Turkey. U.S. officials said they regarded the report as highly plausible.

Terrorism apart, some of last week's developments in the Middle East carried with them the faintest hint of a possible change for the better. A strengthened role in Arab affairs by a moderate Egypt would be a welcome sign; if Arafat can secure the support of Egypt and Saudi Arabia, he might enter into an agreement with Jordan, which in turn could help to get the long-stalled peace process moving again. In Washington last week, Egyptian Foreign Minister Kamal Hassan Ali emphasized that his country remains committed to the Camp David accords.

At the same time, Syrian President Hafez Assad told the French newsweekly *Le Point*, "Syria does not want to continue confrontation with the U.S. in Lebanon, but I have no choice. When the Americans bombard us we are obviously obliged to defend ourselves." *Le Point's* interviewers said that Assad, who has been ailing for six weeks, appeared to be regaining his strength after suffering what they speculated had been a heart attack. Unquestionably Damascus was discomfited by a U.S. approach to one of Syria's archenemies, neighboring Iraq. After talks with Mubarak in Cairo, U.S. Special Envoy Donald Rumsfeld flew to Baghdad for discussions with Iraqi President Saddam Hussein. It was one of the few meetings of top Iraqi and American officials since diplomatic ties between the two countries were severed in 1967. It was also a step Mubarak had been advocating for some time as a way of showing U.S. sympathy for Iraq in its war with Iran. While Washington was quick to point out that it remained neutral in the gulf war, U.S. officials knew that the gesture to Baghdad would displease both Iran and Syria, two countries that have been giving the U.S. some problems of a different sort. —By William E. Smith. Reported by Dean Brelis/Tripoli and William Stewart/Beirut

ITALY

Christmas Gift

Menaced, maimed, then freed

Over the past two decades, Italians have certainly seen more than their share of photographs portraying forlorn kidnap victims. But this one was particularly pathetic: a woman and her son huddled together, chains around their necks, a pistol held to the woman's left temple, the right side of the youth's face caked with dried blood. In a barbaric attempt to force a ransom payment rumored to be as large as \$4.2 million, the kidnapers apparently had cut off the youth's ear. If the money was not forthcoming, they warned, their two captives would be slaughtered.

The latest victims were Anna Bulgari Calissoni, 56, part owner of the world-famous Bulgari jewelry chain, and her 17-year-old son Giorgio. Mrs. Calissoni,



Kidnap photo of Anna and Giorgio Calissoni
A barbaric attempt to obtain ransom.

granddaughter of Constantine Bulgari, a founder of the firm, and wife of retired General Franco Calissoni, was abducted along with her son on Nov. 19 from her country home 20 miles south of Rome. It was not the first time kidnapers had singled out the family: in 1975 Gianni Bulgari, Anna's cousin, was abducted, and released only after the family paid a ransom of about \$2 million. The family was believed to have been ready to pay off this time too, but a Rome magistrate blocked the Bulgari assets; Italian officials have used the tactic to discourage kidnaping.

Angered by the move, the abductors telephoned Laura Calissoni, 29, daughter of Anna and sister of Giorgio, and informed her that something was waiting in a trash can in Rome's Piazza Santa Maria Maggiore. There in a plastic bag the family found a severed ear that investigators believed to be Giorgio's. A second caller directed a reporter from the Rome daily *Il Messaggero* to another garbage can, in Piazza Barberini, where the photograph was

found, accompanied by two messages. One, from Anna Calissoni, was addressed to Pope John Paul II. "I pray you," the note read, "to intercede in an unofficial and discreet manner with my family so that they may free us from this torment and allow us to regain our human dignity." In the second message, the kidnapers offered "our reply to the so-called blockage of assets": if their demands were not met, they would "do away" with the hostages. The message was signed *Comunisti d'Attacco* (Communists of the Attack).

The episode was reminiscent of the kidnaping of the grandson of Oil Tycoon John Paul Getty in Rome in 1973, when young Getty's ear was cut off and mailed to *Il Messaggero*. His family eventually paid a reported \$2.8 million to his abductors. Last week's grisly find renewed debate in Italy about the wisdom of blocking ransom payments. The Bulgari and Calissoni families issued a statement to the effect that negotiations with the kidnapers would continue, suggesting that the authorities may have made it possible for the family to circumvent the magistrate's action and pay a ransom. That suspicion was reinforced when, on Christmas Eve, the Bulgari heiress and her boy were suddenly freed in an area south of Rome. No mention was made, by the police or the Bulgari family, of any ransom having been paid. ■

SOVIET UNION


Confessions

A "walk in the woods" plan

Going to confession is never easy, but it can try men's souls in Moscow. Since KGB agents presumably keep electronic ears tuned to the foreign community in the Soviet capital, many diplomats, journalists and businessmen who want to confer privately with a priest suspect that their innermost thoughts may be known to others than God.

Father Robert Fortin, 51, the American Roman Catholic chaplain who holds Mass each Sunday for many in the foreign community at the U.S. embassy snack bar or in his apartment on Kutuzovskiy Prospekt, has come up with a practical way for his parishioners to ease their consciences without fear of being overheard. In a variation on traditional Roman Catholic practice, the chaplain granted general absolution to all who attended special services in the holiday season. But for those who still want to speak individually with him, Fortin offers a "walk in the woods" procedure that he hopes will foil eavesdroppers: he has agreed to hear confession on the run, so to speak, while strolling around town or through a Moscow park. As Fortin explains to his flock, "You are all in delicate positions here. You should not be forced to decide between risking your professional status and security or gaining forgiveness for your sins." ■

Design



Architect Kevin Roche's General Foods corporate office in suburban New York suggests a Renaissance palace of glass and white aluminum

Classic Values, New Forms

The year's finest work bows to the past while shaping the future

The recent wave of nostalgia for a presumably friendlier, less menacing world of the past is beginning to have an effect on design. America's sudden love affair with old buildings, almost any old buildings, is prompting the architects of new buildings to work with traditional forms and ornamentation. The renewed appreciation of older cities is giving more emphasis to the importance of livable urban design. Indoors, designers are beginning to domesticate some of the gadgets that are beeping us, buzzing us, little-red-light-flashing us and computer-accessing us into an awesome and intriguing electronic future.

Among the 1983 buildings that reconnect functional modern architecture with classic and familiar gestures, the best is Philip Johnson and John Burgee's A T & T building in New York City. Many critics who earlier chattered indignantly about the building's Chipendale pediment now realize that in fact it tops a slender, handsomely articulated granite tower best described as

New York's bustling South Street Seaport



The Johnson-Burgee A T & T: a noble gesture



THOMAS H. HARRIS

noble. Nor does it just stand there. It rises impressively out of the confusion of Madison Avenue and gives that teeming thoroughfare a much needed lift.

The new corporate office of General Foods in Westchester County, N.Y., makes its concession to history not by adapting ornamental forms but by shaping white aluminum and glass into a graceful, lyrical palace reminiscent of the work of the great 16th century architect Palladio. Designed by Kevin Roche, John Dinkeloo & Associates, it has genuine richness and grandeur.

Another happy union of old and new is celebrated at the Mount Vernon Church condominiums in Boston, designed by Graham Gund Associates. Gund made the ruins of a burned-out neo-Romanesque church the framework for modern brick apartment houses. While old and new each maintains its integrity, the two combine in one unique, exciting yet harmonious structure.


Incorporated by East River breezes, the vista of the Brooklyn Bridge and the aroma of the old Fulton Fish Market, New York City's South Street Seaport is unquestionably the year's most dramatic contribution to urban livability. A maritime museum, renovated warehouses, a

Boston's Mount Vernon Church condos



PHOTOGRAPHY





Mud Island at Memphis: hop, skip and splash

new market hall, pushcarts, restaurants, stalls and stores that are not just cute boutiques, all evoke the atmosphere and bustle of the long-gone sailing-ship harbor. The architects are Benjamin Thompson & Associates, Beyer Blinder Belle, and Jan Hird Pokorny.

In Memphis, an unsightly sandbank at the confluence of the Mississippi and Wolf rivers was transformed in mid-1982 into an ingenious recreation park by the architectural firm Roy P. Harrover & Associates. Fifty-acre Mud Island, just off the center of downtown, is now attracting national attention. It offers riverside recreation, marinas, a 4,300-seat auditorium and audiovisual displays. Kids love to hop, skip and splash down a 2,000-ft.-long contour model of the Mississippi River as they study historical and geographical markers.

In the realm of industrial design, one of the year's most handsome achievements is the décor of the Arlington, Va., headquarters of the newspaper *USA Today*. Working within an ugly rented office building, Environmental Planning & Research, interior designers, emphasized the same "user friendly" efficiency that is built into computers. While reporters' desks, or "stations," are arranged in straight rows, editors and rewrite staff oc-



USA Today newsroom in Arlington, Va.: as "user friendly" as the computers

cupy dog-bone-shaped control desks designed for easy consultation.

Though many contemporary hi-fi components are bulky and intimidating, the Magnavox compact disc player, designed by Robert I. Blaich, director of Concern Industrial Design, for N.V. Philips, does away with the aggressively




Magnavox disc player; below, Genesis phone




high-tech look. Confident of the machine's technical sophistication, the designer could afford to understate his case and give it an honest simplicity. The same straightforwardness—with a touch of cheerful flair and color—makes A T & T's new, expandable Genesis telephone at home wherever it is plugged in. Designed by Donald M. Genaro and John McGarvey of Henry Dreyfus Associates, it automatically dials frequently called numbers, features a display screen that gives the time and date and can, with the insertion of an optional cartridge, remind the user of appointments, birthdays and other messages.

Detroit's triumph of 1983 is the Pontiac Fiero, whose all-plastic body displays a grace too long missing from American automobiles. Its streamline hood reflects race-car design, while the angular rear end conveys both youthful elegance and solidity. The mid-mounted engine ensures good weight distribution and handling.

Few of the year's graphic designs rise above banality and confusion; most suffer from the kind of overdesign that tends to interfere with the message. A delightful exception: the dust jacket for Françoise Sagan's novel *The Painted Lady* (E.P. Dutton), designed by Jane Sterrett under Nancy Ethridge's art direction. Its whimsical illustration and expressive lettering call attention to the book without cheapening its literary appeal. —By Wolf Von Eckardt



Pontiac's Fiero coupe: graceful style rather than superficial "styling"



Jane Sterrett's whimsical, expressive book jacket

Press

Bright New Eyes for Texas

Canadian owners jazz up a cautious, folksy daily

When a newspaper is sold by local owners to out-of-towners, the staff, and for that matter the readers, often frets that the new management will give an old friend a gaudy new face. That worry rippled through Houston in October after the family of Texas Lieutenant Governor William Hobby sold the city's oldest (founded 1885) daily, the cautious, folksy *Post* (circ. 402,000), for \$100 million to perhaps the ultimate absentees: Canadians. The buyer, the Toronto Sun Publishing Corp., has three Canadian dailies that specialize in short, sensational stories and photos of bare-chested men and barely dressed women. The *Houston Chronicle* (circ. 459,000), perhaps shaken by the prospect of a rivalry in what has been one of the U.S.'s least competitive two-newspaper cities, sent a reporter to Toronto to survey the Canadian group's flagship *Sun*. His report on what might come to Texas ran under the headline A SHOCKING CHANGE?

The change in the *Post* has taken effect this month, and while hardly shocking, it is surely dramatic. Visually, the revamped paper is a kaleidoscope of brightly inked boxes, outside color photos and bold black headlines; editorially, it is terse and feisty, especially in its newly argumentative opinion pages. To the potential disappointment of some readers, however, there will be no cheesecake—or beefcake. Says British-born Editor in Chief Peter O'Sullivan, 34: "The 'Sunshine Girl' has a certain, if you will pardon the expression, grab appeal for the *Sun*, a tabloid dependent on street sales. But the *Houston Post* is a different kind of paper, and we do not want to alienate the circulation that we paid for." Still, the paper will be raffish: the owners seek not so much to cut into the *Chronicle's* circulation as to catch the eyes of people who do not now read a daily newspaper. Says Director of Marketing Marvin Naftolin: "We are looking for the young adult. The papers here have not been exciting or interesting enough to attract them."

The new paper is a tabloid in spirit, though not in actual size: it emphasizes crime, sex, sports and weather, and devotes about half of each front page to local news. Combat in the Middle East got prominent play last week, but the paper was almost devoid of serious stories about politics or Government in Washington, and the results of Japan's elections were reported back on page 10. The business section depends heavily on wire-service copy and emphasizes consumers rather

than industry and finance; the feature section resembles a traditional women's page, with stories about office parties, bargain clothes and Christmas gifts to hairdressers, rather than the issue-oriented life-style articles that appear in many big-city papers.

The transplanted Canadians concede that they are still learning the local mentality. A restyled regional weather map, for example, had to be quickly scrapped in favor of a national one. Explains O'Sullivan: "One of the attractions of living here is gloating about how all your friends up North are freezing." To help ease the transition, the owners elevated Columnist Lynn Ashby, who is probably

THE HOUSTON POST



Northerly breeze: new Editor O'Sullivan
"The *Chronicle* will have to react."

Houston's best-known newspaperman, to the new post of editor, overseeing the opinion pages. Says Ashby: "The city has badly needed a public discussion of issues. I do not ask people to agree with us, but I want us to be the first thing they pick up in the morning." His program: expanded political coverage, more guest-column slots for ordinary citizens, and "taking some of the cynicism and acidity" out of one of the old paper's anomalous, shrill features, the staff-written replies to letters to the editor.

Under the ownership of the Hobby family since 1930, the *Post* had enjoyed a

reputation for balanced and, by low-key Houston standards, diligent local coverage; it won a Pulitzer Prize for investigative reporting in 1965. Yet despite the bipartisan political involvement of family members—including the paper's late chairman, William Hobby, who was Democratic Governor of Texas from 1917 to 1921, and his widow and successor Oveta Culp Hobby, who was, under President Eisenhower, the first Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare—the paper rarely crusaded. For four days after the *New York Times* published the classified Pentagon papers in 1971, the *Post* did not even mention the disclosures. The initial reaction of the younger William Hobby, then executive editor: "Aw, that's no story." When Hobby ran for Lieutenant Governor in 1972, the *Post* published four Page One editorials supporting him during the Democratic primary, yet never mentioned his connection with the paper.

Predictably, the staff is divided about the new look. Some describe the *Post* as an imitator of the Gannett Co.'s national daily, *USA Today*. In its emphasis on crime and catastrophe, the *Post* also resembles the British popular dailies on which the *Toronto Sun* was modeled. Complains one *Post* veteran: "It looks like a newspaper in a clown suit." Others share the view of a reporter who says, "It is like having somebody let fresh air into a stale room—we needed it, but some people find it a little cold." Advertisers too are hesitant. David Huskey, senior vice president of marketing and sales promotion at Joske's, a department-store chain, says, "I do not buy advertising based on graphics and color. We are going to have to wait a few months to see how the changes have affected circulation and demographics."

Houston residents are also waiting to see whether the new *Post* and the reawakened *Chronicle* will become more vigorously competitive. A war between them could be ugly: O'Sullivan denounces the *Chronicle* report about the *Toronto Sun* as "the sleaziest journalism I have seen in a long time." On the other hand, the result could resemble what happened in Dallas, 250 miles to the north, where a stepped-up rivalry since the mid-'70s has led both the *Times Herald* and the *Morning News* to open new bureaus, recruit top-rank reporters and expand coverage, especially of international and economic news. The *Houston Chronicle's* executive managing editor—news, Dan Cobb, says, "I'm pretty well impressed with the content of the new *Post*. It's not nearly what I thought it would be. Competition may sharpen their paper and ours too." Says *Post* Editor O'Sullivan: "The *Houston Post* papers before seemed to have sort of a mutual nonaggression pact. But if we are even moderately successful, the *Chronicle* will have to react. I think it is going to be fun."

—By William A. Henry III

Reported by David S. Jackson/Houston

Video

Daddy's Disturbed Little Girl

With a movie about incest, TV again explores the forbidden

Television taboos are made to be broken. Violating them is a venerated tradition, a familiar ritual preceded by elaborate puffery: solemn sermons or titillating teasers aimed at increasing curiosity and ratings. Though often a mindless come-on rather than a thoughtful coming out, the "breakthrough" can sometimes mirror changing cultural mores and set the stage for bolder TV sequels.

In the fall of 1972, ABC's *That Certain Summer* sensitively, if self-consciously, examined a homosexual relationship between a devoted father and a younger man. Yet it was not until the sitcom *Love, Sidney*, nine years later, that an apparent homosexual was depicted with some degree of calm as the title character in a series. In 1974, *A Case of Rape* with Elizabeth Montgomery was the first major TV drama to take a composed but telling look at that crime from the woman's point of view. The identical theme was sensationally exploited the same year with *Born Innocent*, which cast Teen-Ager Linda Blair as the victim of a sexual assault committed with a broom handle. Although prime-time dramatizations of proscribed subjects get most of the



Danson and Zal in *Something About Amelia*: confuting the stereotypes
Sanctimony, warnings for parents and a scholarly bibliography

attention, taboos are often first broached on soap operas. In October, for example, the creators of *All My Children* arranged the maiden, if not maidenly, appearance of a continuing lesbian character.

Now a new ABC movie is billing itself as the first serious drama to explore another forbidden television topic: father-daughter incest. (Brother-sister love was peeped at earlier this year by NBC's *Princess Daisy*.) The two-hour show *Something About Amelia*, scheduled for Jan. 9, is receiving the prudent treatment

that is usually accorded "controversial" subjects. Its promotional material comes replete with warnings for parents and a scholarly bibliography. Nevertheless, despite the effluence of manufactured sanctimony, *Amelia* is a taut and honest, if somewhat monochromatic, treatment of a painful subject.

Steven Bennett (Ted Danson of *Cheers*) drives the kind of station wagon that has ersatz wood along the sides. He is a likable TV dad who lugs a briefcase to an unspecified job and calls his daughter "Princess." With a model wife (Glenn Close) and two exemplary daughters-in-residence, everything ought to be as comfy cozy as *Father Knows Best*. But Bennett conceals a malign secret: he is sexually abusing his 13-year-old daughter Amelia (played with poker-faced intensity by Roxana Zal).

Amelia confutes the stereotypes of incest and most TV movies: there is no drunken, leering father and no happy ending. If anything, the characters err slightly on the side of restraint. The main flaw in this relentlessly flat and realistic approach lies in the written character of the social workers and psychologists who deal with the problem. They are all unrelievedly sympathetic. But this is a minor quibble. *Amelia* provides an exception to the network's tired formula for taboo breaking by avoiding prurience and comforting clichés. —By Richard Stengel

Cheers (NBC). Now in its second season, this barroom sitcom has found its saucy stride and, in Stars Ted Danson and Shelley Long, has created a mismatched pair that could give Tracy and Hepburn a run for their moxie.

Faerie Tale Theatre (Showtime). These slightly fractured but never completely Grimm tales, produced by Actress Shelley Duvall, give a hip, witty twist and dreamy visual style to storybook classics.

The Life and Adventures of Nicholas Nickleby (Mobil Showcase Network). Even squeezed to fit the small screen, the Royal Shakespeare Company's epic entertainment still ranked as a unique theatrical treat. The nine-hour drama preserved 150 great performances in a format Dickens would have loved: the mini-series.

Motown 25: Yesterday, Today, Forever (NBC). A stirring video jukebox of the most memorable sounds of a quarter-century of soul, from the still irresistible Temptations through the stylized showmanship of Michael Jackson.

Nickelodeon (Warner Amex Satellite Entertainment Co.). A channel devoted to children without being childish. Among its most notable enticements: the *Pinwheel* puppets for preschoolers, and *LiveWire*, an exuberant variety talk show for early teens.



NBC News Overnight. "Being best is not enough," rued NBC News Chief Reuven Frank in canceling this late-night paragon after 17 months. Insomniacs will miss *Overnight*'s tough reporting, its sprightly sense of the absurd and especially its Queen of Tart, Co-Anchor Linda Ellerbee. The first nightly news show good enough to warrant reruns.

Special Bulletin (NBC). Gripping in a way that *The Day After* was not, this docudrama presented a fictional nuclear crisis as a news event actually in progress. The result was a dark parody of the pontifical way in which the networks package disaster.

Sunday Morning with Charles Kuralt (CBS). Light but never lightweight, this 90-minute eye opener demonstrates that long-form magazine shows can work, and that Kuralt is as nimble off the road as on.

Swan Lake, Minnesota (ARTS). Swan maidens in tutus riding bales of hay up a conveyor belt? This poetic, disarmingly simple adaptation of the classic ballet inventively mixed a country-and-western twang with Tchaikovskyian lyricism.

Viet Nam: A Television History (PBS). With its painstaking marshaling of detail, this 13-hour documentary was television as the first draft of history. It was, by turns, poignant and chilling and never blinked.



From Germany, the new Audi 5000S luxury sedan



Over the years, Audi has developed a reputation for putting its advanced designs on the road while other car makers were still on the drawing board.

The new Audi 5000S sedan and wagon are no exception.

Having recently introduced the 5000S sedan—the automobile voted Europe's "Car of The Year"—Audi engineers then redefined the very concept of a wagon.

The result? An automobile that, like the sedan, is reshaping the world's thinking about automotive design. An automobile so

advanced in its styling, there's some question as to whether it should be called a "wagon".

The Aerodynamics Of An Exotic Sports Car. All of the advanced styling and engineering concepts of the Audi 5000S sedan have been incorporated into the 5000S wagon.

A drag coefficient of only 0.35 results not only in one of the most "air slippery" designs ever conceived, but in the kind of performance more normally associated with sophisticated sports cars.

Engineered For Speed And Agility. Acceleration for both cars is brisk: 0 to 50 mph in just 8.0 seconds for the sedan, 8.4 seconds for the wagon.

Tracking and directional control are outstanding, even in strong crosswinds. Handling, cornering and general maneuverability are astounding for cars of this size and type—the result of Audi's leadership in front-wheel-drive technology and high-performance suspensions.

Advanced Design Has Its Practical Side. If the staid, utilitarian image of conven-

This year's auto shows will feature
a number of stunningly aerodynamic
prototypes you can't buy.

And two you can.



and wagon.

*Manufacturer's suggested retail price. Title, taxes, transportation, registration and dealer delivery charges additional. ©1993 Porsche Audi

tional wagons has kept you from buying one, the new Audi wagon is well worth your consideration.

Inherent in its dramatic styling is a wealth of carrying space. With either or both rear seats folded down, it provides a carpeted expanse over six and one-half feet in length. The tailgate opens flush with the rear deck for easy loading. Beneath the rear deck is additional hidden storage space.

The interiors of both the sedan and wagon are supremely luxurious and handsomely equipped with full instrumentation

including our new, computerized Auto Check System.

To enhance the feeling of luxury, gracefully curved windows mounted flush with the roofline all but eliminate wind noise.

Exceptional Automobiles Deserve An Exceptional Warranty. Road tested over 3.2 million kilometers in Europe, Africa and North America, the new Audi 5000S automobiles have proven themselves to be of such high quality and reliability, we have covered them with an outstanding new 24

month unlimited mileage, limited warranty. See your local Porsche Audi dealer for complete details.

Totally innovative in design and engineering, and priced at only \$16,480* for the sedan and \$17,480* for the wagon, the new Audis may well be today's best automotive values.

The proof is in the test drive.

For your nearest dealer call toll-free: (800) 447-4700. **PORSCHE + AUDI**

Audi: the art of engineering.

Sport

A Ticket to Green Pastures

Devil's Bag, the next Secretariat, is syndicated for \$36 million

In horse racing, the pikers bet at the windows. The plungers invest in the unborn offspring of untested virgins, whose sex lives are not the only adventures ahead of them. Last week Devil's Bag, a two-year-old object of unprecedented affection, began lining up female companionship for early 1985, charging \$1 million for an annual date. Even in the outlandish economy of Thoroughbred racing, where one yearling colt sold last July for \$10.2 million, this is impressive. Eleven years ago, when Secretariat was a two-year-old of brilliant promise, his future favors were parceled out at an unheard-of \$190,000 a share. But the stunning news is not that Devil's Bag will be more exclusive than Secretariat. He just might be better.

Granted, hardboots can be sentimental about a horse on the lead, and recent misfortunes may be spurring their hopes. It seems that every potential champion of late—Timely Writer, Landaluce, Roving Boy—has become a casualty, if not a fatality. But the dream is alive in Devil's Bag, who in his five starts, the past three of them stakes, has yet to trail any horse at any pole. Racing purely within himself, for he has never felt a whip, Devil's Bag won the Cowdin in stakes-record time for seven furlongs, and the Champagne in stakes-record time for a mile, both at Belmont in New York. At the Laurel Futurity in Maryland, without even trying, he sped 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ in 1:42 $\frac{1}{2}$, three-fifths of a second over Spectacular Bid's track record.

Devil's Bag would have concluded his shiny season last month in the Remsen Stakes at New York's Aqueduct, but he stepped on a stone and cautiously called it a year. He will winter at Hialeah and prepare for the Florida races, pointing to the Kentucky Derby in May and the Triple Crown glories ahead. The holders of the syndicate's 26 paid shares, whose \$26 million buys the right to breed 26 mares a season, will also participate in the expenses, the spoils and the risks next year before Devil's Bag goes to stud at Kentucky's Claiborne Farm.

Consider the perils, just the odds on getting a horse to the Derby post. If he stays sound in training, will he be lucky in traffic? And whatever he achieves at the

track is no guarantee of success in the breeding shed. Secretariat was the supreme race horse, but on the dollar list stands 24th among leading active sires and is not in the top 60 this year. For those who play with bloodlines, the stock market must seem boring.

Ten other syndicate shares were reserved by the former owner of Devil's Bag, James P. Mills of Hickory Tree Stable in Middleburg, Va., so it is a \$36 mil-



The old Kentucky trainer, Stephens, and his particular pet, Devil's Bag

"He has an awful sweet disposition. This colt's a natural runner."

lion transaction, all told. Conquistador Cielo, that monstrous comet of 1982, may have considered the \$910,000 he had been drawing per client to be a lot. It is said in England that the stallion Shareef Dancer gets \$1 million. Well, if so, he has been matched by a juvenile. Mills' wife Alice discovered Devil's Bag at Windfields Farm on Maryland's Eastern Shore, where he was bred, the relatively humble son of Halo, in the more elegant company of many junior Native Daners. The price was good (\$325,000), but the timing was spectacular. After one of Halo's boys, Sunny's Halo, took this year's Kentucky Derby, the value of a full brother of Devil's Bag leaped to \$1 million. Halo's stud fees have soared from \$30,000 to \$100,000.

The unglamorous name Devil's Bag comes from a TV adaptation of Washington Irving's *The Legend of Sleepy Hollow* and refers to an enchanted sack whose magic, when doubted by a teacher, wrought fiery destruction on the school-


house. According to Trainer Woody Stephens, 70, a cut-down Ichabod Crane in a brown fedora, the name does not suit the horse. "He has an awful sweet disposition," says Stephens, who admittedly is hard-pressed to find anything unadmirable about a horse. "When he trains in the morning, he comes back happy, eats at the hayrack and actually lies down for a bit. The really relaxed ones will do that." Woody has been observing horses' habits since his father took him off a mule and put him on a pony to country school in Midway, Ky. At 14 he left home to be a jockey, but grew to be a trainer of stature. It was Woody who took the gimpy Conquistador and, over six wild days, followed the fastest mile in the history of New York, the Metropolitan Handicap, with one of the most routing Belmont Stakes.

While Stephens has won each of the Triple Crown jewels separately, it is not the same as taking them all at once. Though he professes to love his charges equally, his voice lifts when discussing Devil's Bag: "He was being broke the first time I saw him, good-looking but one of several. I started to breeze him that February, but I didn't know until May. He was going along with a bunch of others, but so much easier. I thought: 'This colt's a natural runner.'" He's a showy dude, deep brown with a white-stripe blaze. "A masculine horse with a little bit of tummy on him," Woody says. "All man," agrees Rider Eddie Maple, who has tapped Devil's Bag on the shoulder but never whapped him on the rump. "He's broad and he's got those big old eyes." Maple says: "You don't see them that often."

Next week the Horse of the Year will be proclaimed by the *Daily Racing Form*, the National Turf Writers and the Thoroughbred Racing Associations. It is a three-horse race: the Woodward and Jockey Club Gold Cup winner Slew O'Gold, the French filly All Along and Devil's Bag. Only Secretariat ever won it at two, when the older candidates were weaker. So some voters may insist on seeing Devil's Bag challenged first. "Some day we're going to have to call on him," says Stephens, "and you'll see a horse who'll fight back." As it happens, the second most impressive two-year-old, Swale, is another pupil of Woody's. The thought of two such talents in one barn is taking people back to Calumet days 35 years ago, to Citation and Coaltown, names like plucked strings, back when horses made love for a song.

—By Tom Callahan


People



Satisfaction: Richards and Hansen

It was described by a publicist as a "very simple" wedding, but for the denizens of the Mexican town of Cabo San Lucas, the marriage last week of Rolling Stone **Keith Richards** and his longtime girlfriend, Model **Pattie Hansen**, 27, was more flash than fiesta. Best Man **Mick Jagger**, 40, flew in from Barbados, where he has been under cover with Girlfriend **Jerry Hall**, 27. Richards' divorced parents were there: Doris, in from London, and Bert, in from New York. Also present were Patti's mother, sister, three brothers and a few fishermen. After the short ceremony, guests were treated to the mellow sounds of a *marachi* band. Looks like this tuxedo-clad Stone, who turned 40 the same day, may finally be starting to slow down the beat.

The camera pans a busy Manhattan street, then zooms in on a pert brunette whose spunk and bright-eyed appeal



Modern love: Kristofferson and Thomas in *Kathryn Beck*

tell us she is, well, *That Girl*. Still a role model for today's single woman, **Marlo Thomas**, 45, has grown up since her carefree days as the star of the popular 1960s television series. In *The Last Honor of Kathryn Beck*, a two-hour TV movie filmed in Chicago and Springfield, Ill., Thomas plays a divorced woman who is harassed by the police in their search for her fugitive lover, played by **Kris Kristofferson**, 47. Says Thomas of her latest television persona: "She's past *That Girl* but is not quite a feminist. She's like a lot of divorced women—somewhere in the middle."

It's the first day of 1984. Through bleary eyes, you tune



Big Brother show: Cage, Cunningham, Paik, Anderson and Moorman

into television, to be greeted by "Good morning, Mr. Orwell." Oh no, has the British author's dark and malevolent fable of total totalitarianism finally arrived? Not really. Simply a



A pie-eyed Prince Charles creaming a bystander in Manchester

group of avant-gardists greeting the new year with a public television, cross-Atlantic extravaganza dedicated to George Orwell, author of

as a "celebration." Presumably, Big Brother will not be watching.

"It's best if you just do it," said a deadpan **Prince Charles**, 36, when confronted with pie-slinging Subject Kati Slater, 15, during a visit to a newly opened West Indian community center in Manchester, England. She did indeed do it. And Charles got it in the princely puss. Steve Starkie, who was standing near by, found it amusing—until Charles proved that he too can dish it out and left Steve foaming at the mouth. The Prince was, as one British newspaper put it, "His Royal Piennes." —By Guy D. Garcia

On the Record

David Shire, 46, composer of the new Broadway musical about having children, *Baby*: "You can sort of be married, you can sort of be divorced, you can sort of be living together, but you can't sort of have a baby. It's a simple primary decision. Do you have it or do you not? And in answering that question, you have to define your relationship."

Isaac Bashevis Singer, 79, Nobel laureate, on his diet: "I did not become a vegetarian for my health. I did it for the health of the chickens."

Iris Murdoch, 64, British novelist: "The only people in the world I am envious of are those with pools, especially heated ones."

Nineteen Eighty-Four and "the first media prophet and philosopher." That's the view of the program's creator, Video Virtuoso **Nam June Paik**, 51, who intends to show television as a "liberating" force, not fraught with the "negative aspects" emphasized by Orwell. To this end, he has enlisted the talents of a curious assortment of the old- and new-wave *garde*, including Performance Artist **Laurie Anderson**, 36, Composers **John Cage**, 71, and **Philip Glass**, 46, Choreographer **Merce Cunningham**, 64, Beat Poet **Allen Ginsberg**, 57, Rock Singer **Peter Gabriel**, 33, and Cellist **Charlotte Moorman**, 44, once celebrated for her topless playing. Directed by Paik from the Pompidou Center in Paris and by **George Plimpton**, 56, acting as host at a studio in Manhattan, the one-hour live broadcast is described by Paik

Music

Bel Canto of the Barroom

A package of 16 vintage LPs documents Sinatra's vocal art

Let him learn the manner to glide with the vowels, and to drag the voice gently from the high to the lower notes," advised Pier Francesco Tosi in his book *Observations on the Florid Song*. "Let him take care that the higher the notes, the more it is necessary to touch them with softness, to avoid screaming. Let him take care that the words are uttered in such a manner that they be distinctly understood."

That was back in 1723. In the years since then, the art of bel canto so prized by Italian singers of the time has fallen into desuetude among their operatic descendants. But not in pop music, where one Italian baritone has, however unwittingly, put Tosi's recommendations into practice throughout his four-decade career: Frank Sinatra. A 16-album, \$350 set of vintage recordings, recently released on the audiophile label Mobile Fidelity Sound Lab, documents Sinatra's vocal art at its peak.

That peak came between 1953 and 1962, when Sinatra was recording for Capitol Records. Teamed with arrangers such as Billy May, Gordon Jenkins and,



The singer in 1957: master of mood and nuance

especially, Nelson Riddle, Sinatra finally put to rest the "Swoonatra" image of his youth to become a singer of astonishing breadth, consummate technique and unrivaled intensity.

Whether forlornly ruminating on Alec Wilder's *I'll Be Around*, with a lonely piano

and solitary celeste offering gentle support, or swinging easy with Cole Porter's *Just One of Those Things* against a background of burbling saxophones, or punching out Julie Styne and Sammy Cahn's *Five Minutes More* in front of some antiphonal spitfire trumpets that would have made Gabrieli gladly forsake San Marco for the recording studio, Sinatra is a master of mood and vocal nuance. He can ornament a line, subtly altering its rhythm, or bend just a single note to startlingly expressive purpose; he sings the first word of *Just One of Those Things* with a momentarily indeterminate pitch that colors the entire song with tantalizing emotional ambiguity. As evoked by Sinatra on *I Love Paris*, the city has never been sexier than "in the summer, when it sssizzles."

Above all, though, is Sinatra's urgent sincerity, which persuades the listener that for the moment at least, the singer and his song are one. In real life, Sinatra may bully hapless casino dealers and harass would-be biographers, but in concert with a chorus of moppets on *High Hopes* he seems a natural to lead next year's third-grade outing. And when Sinatra sings that definitive barroom lament, *One for My Baby*, even a teetotaler is tempted to light up a cigarette and order one more for the road. Now that is bel canto indeed.

—By Michael Walsh

CLASSICAL

Bach: Brandenburg Concertos (Archiv). Trevor Pinnock leads his crack English Concert in crisp, exuberant performances.

Bartók: The Miraculous Mandarin; Two Portraits (Deutsche Grammophon). Bartók's bloodcurdling ballet gets an elemental reading from Claudio Abbado and the London Symphony.

Elliott Carter: Night Fantasies; Piano Sonata (Nonesuch). One of the landmarks of 20th century keyboard music, the *Sonata* (1945-46) is definitively interpreted by the late Paul Jacobs.

Copland: Short Symphony; Ives: Symphony No. 3 (Pro Arte). Quintessential slices of orchestral Americana, lovingly realized by Dennis Russell Davies and the St. Paul Chamber Orchestra.

Charles Tomlinson Griffes: Piano Music (Nonesuch). Griffes' unique brand of American romantic impressionism gets a persuasive reassessment from Noël Lee.

Philip Glass: Koyaanisqatsi (Antilles). The minimalist sound track from the movie stands on its own as a symphonic suite of rare power and passion.

Janáček: Jenůfa (London). The greatest of Leoš Janáček's nine operas gets a recording worthy of its stature from Sir Charles Mackerras and Soprano Elisabeth Söderström.

Puccini: La Rondine (CBS Masterworks). Kiri Te Kanawa, Plácido Domingo and Conductor Lorin Maazel star in Puccini's unaccountably neglected confectioneer's delight.

Verdi: Falstaff (Deutsche Grammophon). Renato Bruson is an autumnal Sir John in Carlo Maria Giulini's bittersweet live recording.

Wagner: Tristan und Isolde (Philips). Soprano Hildegard Behrens is a stellar Wagnerian in Leonard Bernstein's incandescent performance of the most erotic of operas.



ROCK AND JAZZ

David Bowie: Let's Dance (EMI America). Smooth and elegant, like the edge of a new knife, this sharp, soulful album marked Bowie's return to top form.

Culture Club: Colour by Numbers (Virgin). Lead Singer Boy George may look like Peter Pan at a transvestite Mardi Gras, but this band purveys a straight and joyous brand of pop.

Wynton Marsalis: Think of One (Columbia). Mathematical arabesques on the trumpet by a 22-year-old who is fast turning from a prodigy into a world-class pro.

Malcolm McLaren: Duck Rock (Island). The year's funniest and most slappappy dance record mixes Zulu chants, New York City jump-rope songs and hip-hop street culture into an anthropological jamboree.

Randy Newman: Trouble in Paradise (Warner Bros.). Part stand-up comedy, part *The Day of the Locust*: Newman's best since 1972's *Sail Away*.

Linda Ronstadt and the Nelson Riddle Orchestra: What's New (Asylum). Nine standards, done straight, by a pop queen collaborating with an old orchestra master. It must have seemed crazy, but it's a hit and a seemingly effortless tour de force.

Paul Simon: Hearts and Bones (Warner Bros.). The finest album yet by one of the best songwriters in anybody's neighborhood.

Talking Heads: Speaking in Tongues (Sire). SoHo soul and uptown rhythm: nobody mixes it up better.

U2: War (Island). Righteous rock with social savvy, fierce as a street fight.

X: More Fun in the New World (Elektra). The New Wave rolls on: if William S. Burroughs fronted a garage band, it would sound like this.

An important message from PAUL NEWMAN and JOANNE WOODWARD

"We share our love with seven wonderful children we have never seen."

"We'd like to tell you why."



The seven children the Newman family sponsors are Pedro, Gustavo, Carlos, Johnny, Andres, Jaime, and Laki.

"For 16 years we've been Save the Children sponsors. We began by sponsoring a desperately poor little girl from the mountains of Colombia—a child who lived in a one-room hut and could only dream of attending school.

"It was a joy to share our good fortune with her and to know that she was blossoming because someone cared enough to help. It made us want to help other children in the same way. And now we sponsor seven children around the world. Children we have come to understand and love. Thanks to Save the Children.

"If you've ever wondered 'What can one person do?'—the answer is 'You can help save a child.' If you are touched by the plight of needy children, there is no better way than Save the Children to reach out to them with caring, comfort, and support.

"Please join us as a Save the Children sponsor. We've seen the wonders they can work. You'll see how much you really can do—in the eyes and in the progress of the child you sponsor. You'll bring new hope to a child you'll know personally, as we do, through photo-

graphs...reports...and letters you can exchange, if you wish.

"You'll see despair turn to hope, and you'll feel the personal reward of knowing what your love and support can do.

"The cost is so little. The need is so great. Won't you join us as Save the Children sponsors?"

A sponsorship costs only \$16 a month—less than many other sponsorship agencies. Just \$26 a day. Because 50 years of experience has taught us that direct handouts are the least effective way of helping children, your sponsorship contributions are not distributed in this way. Instead they are used to help children in the most effective way possible — by helping the entire community with projects and services, such as health care, education, food production and nutrition. So hardworking people can help themselves and save their own children.

Fill out this coupon...and share your love with a child.

Yes, I want to join the Newmans as a Save the Children sponsor. My first monthly sponsorship payment of \$16 is enclosed. I prefer to sponsor a boy girl either in the area I've checked below.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Where the need is greatest | <input type="checkbox"/> Bangladesh | <input type="checkbox"/> El Salvador * | <input type="checkbox"/> Lebanon |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Africa | <input type="checkbox"/> Chicano (U.S.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Honduras | <input type="checkbox"/> Mexico |
| <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian | <input type="checkbox"/> Colombia | <input type="checkbox"/> Indonesia | <input type="checkbox"/> Nepal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Appalachia (U.S.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="checkbox"/> Inner Cities (U.S.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Philippines |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Israel | <input type="checkbox"/> Southern States (U.S.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Sri Lanka (Ceylon) |

* LIFELINE Sponsorship—\$14 monthly

Name _____ (Please print)

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

- Instead of becoming a sponsor at this time, I am enclosing a contribution of \$ _____.
- Please send me more information.



Save the Children®

50 Wilton Road, Westport, Connecticut 06880
Attn: David L. Guyer, President

Established 1932. The original child sponsorship agency. YOUR SPONSORSHIP PAYMENTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS ARE U.S. INCOME TAX DEDUCTIBLE. We are indeed proud of our use of funds. Our annual report and audit statement are available upon request. T 1/2/4

© 1983 SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION, INC.


Education

More Clout, More Cash

When E.F. Hutton talks, school districts show big interest

Schools across the country are crying poor more loudly than ever. Last week the Yonkers, N.Y., school district threatened to reopen its schools three weeks late in January unless the city council comes up with an additional \$12 million. Schools in San Jose, Calif., are open, but the district declared bankruptcy in September, and is \$1.7 million in debt. In Lincoln County, Ore., 16 schools closed for almost two weeks this fall until voters approved an increase in property taxes. So what is a school board to do?

Listen to E.F. Hutton perhaps. Pennsylvania school districts have enlisted the services of the big broker and other investment consultants to help them boost the value of their tax revenues, which might otherwise languish in non-interest-bearing checking accounts or small savings accounts that today typically earn only 5 1/2% interest. Since March 1982, a number of districts have been pooling their tax receipts and investing the resulting millions of dollars in the Pennsylvania School District Liquid Asset Fund. The fund buys U.S. and state government securities, Treasury notes and bonds for example, earning interest of about 10%. Result: this year the school fund raised \$15.5 million in interest for its member districts. Voters are happy because the earnings keep property tax increases down. Nor are the school



revenues tied up for long periods of time: districts can write checks on the fund. Says Linford Moyer, executive director of the Pennsylvania Association of School Business Officials: "The fund's advantage is that we have broadened the possibilities of return on investments without jeopardizing safety."

Although many school managers across the country routinely invest their tax dollars, Pennsylvania districts have consolidated their revenues in order to negotiate top interest rates. Some states, Virginia among them, do not allow school districts to make their own investment decisions, but the idea of a pool is begin-

ning to catch on. Michigan and Illinois are working with E.F. Hutton to set up an investment fund early in 1984. Comments James Betchkal, associate director of the Washington-based National School

Boards Association, which is helping to organize the plan: "A lot of school districts are money poor, but very few are short of ready cash. We're finding that even if you have that cash for 24 hours, you can do something with it." Illinois already runs an investment pool for its local governmental agencies, including 200 school districts. "School treasurers often are able to earn enough in interest to pay the salaries of one or more teachers," says Burnell Heinecke, special assistant to the Illinois state treasurer.

Pennsylvania would agree. Since 1982 its fund has grown from seven of its 501 school districts, with pooled assets of \$2 million, to 140 districts, with \$115 million invested as of this fall. The big winners from the pooling of funds are the smaller districts. Notes Norman Weinheimer, executive director of the Michigan School Board Association: "You don't get much interest from a \$15,000 investment by itself, but pooled it draws higher interest."

One such small district is Waynesboro, Pa. By investing \$2.6 million of this year's \$12.6 million budget in the fund, Waynesboro School District Business Manager Wallace Jones expects to increase interest earnings by 20%, to \$200,000, which may be used to buy equipment, such as computers, and reduce property taxes. Says Jones: "Anything you can do to lessen the burden on the taxpayer is very important." ■

Milestones

ENGAGED. **Caroline**, 26, Princess of Monaco, elder daughter of the reigning Prince Rainier III; and **Stefano Casiraghi**, 23, playboy son of a wealthy Italian industrialist; in Monaco. The Dec. 29 wedding date was announced 15 months after Caroline's mother, Princess Grace, died following an auto accident on the Côte d'Azur, France. Caroline will be married for the second time, Casiraghi for the first.

MARRIED. **Loretta Swit**, 42, Nurse Hot Lips Houlihan on CBS's *M*A*S*H* series; and Actor **Dennis Holahan**, 41; she for the first time, he for the second; in Studio City, Calif.

HOSPITALIZED. **Johnny Cash**, 51, stone-faced country and western singer; to avoid chemical dependency; in the Betty Ford Center of Eisenhower Medical Center; in Rancho Mirage, Calif. Fearful that he

might become hooked on drugs after taking prescribed painkillers for sciatic nerve spasms and surgery on a bleeding ulcer, the gravel-voiced Cash checked himself into a rehabilitation program.

HOSPITALIZED. **Isaac Asimov**, 63, sci-fi and nonfiction word factory, with 286 books to his credit and 14 more at his publishers; resting comfortably after triple-bypass heart surgery; in New York City.

AILING. **Joan Miró**, 90, protean Spanish painter of playful, dreamlike canvases; gravely ill with deteriorating respiratory disease; in Palma de Mallorca.

DIED. **John Vivyan**, 68, television actor who played the title role in the 1959-60 adventure series *Mr. Lucky* and more recently appeared in *Simon & Simon* and in

WKRP in Cincinnati; of heart disease; in Santa Monica, Calif.

DIED. **Rod Cameron**, 73, swaggering cowboy actor; after a stroke; in Gainesville, Ga. Cameron played in more than 100 western and action films over almost four decades. On television, he played Police Officer Bart Grant in the series *City Detective* and later starred in *Star Trooper*.

DIED. **Fania Fénelon**, 75, singer in the all-female inmate orchestra at the Auschwitz death camp, who recounted her ordeal in the memoir *Playing for Time*; of a heart attack; in Le Kremlin-Bicêtre, France. Fénelon's 1976 book was made into a television movie four years later, with Vanessa Redgrave portraying Fénelon despite objections because of pro-Palestine Liberation Organization statements.

Books

A Tale of Two Newspapers


GOOD TIMES, BAD TIMES by Harold Evans
Atheneum; 430 pages; \$17.95

Being jilted or fired rarely brings out the best in people. In addition to the natural reactions of pain and anger, the dismissee must cope with the nearly irresistible urge to whine. That injuring so-and-so will never get away with this: the whole, incriminating story must be told. Usually such narratives are limited in circulation to tolerant friends or impassive bartenders ("Set 'em up, Joe"). But a wider and possibly less sympathetic audience can be sought by those victims outraged and talented enough to write a book.

British Journalist Harold Evans is both, as *Good Times, Bad Times* entertainingly proves. His tale has just about everything required by the genre of self-justification: a spurned teller, shifting affections, the whiff of conspiracy, and a villain who grows ever more interesting as the recital of his sins progresses.

In March 1982, Evans resigned after serving just a year as editor of the *Times* of London, one of the world's most eminent newspapers. But he did not leave voluntarily. He was shoved out by Rupert Murdoch, the Australian press baron who had bought the *Times* and its sister publication the *Sunday Times* in 1981. And, in a nice twist, it was Murdoch who had hired Evans in the first place, luring him away from the editorship of the *Sunday Times*, a post he had held for 14 years.

Those were the good times. Given free rein by Canadian Owner Roy Thomson, Evans turned the *Sunday Times* toward tough and thorough investigative reporting, assigning as many as 18 people to long-term projects. This challenge proved



Harold Evans

Entering a preposterous arrangement.

both expensive and risky. Evans calls the British press "half-free" in comparison with U.S. papers. It is easy to incur heavy penalties in England for printing information that the government considers secret; running stories that could prejudice court trials might land an editor in jail. Still, in spite of stiff official resistance, the

Sunday Times managed to publish uncensored excerpts from the diaries of Richard Crossman, a former Cabinet minister. The paper also exposed the important position that Kim Philby had held in British intelligence before he defected to Moscow. Evans chanced contempt of court by publicizing the plight of Britain's some 450 Thalidomide children, afflicted with terrible birth defects because their mothers had taken the medicine during pregnancy. Litigation between parents and the drug's manufacturer had dragged on for a decade, in legally ordained secrecy. Evans' campaign spurred a wave of indignation on the victims' behalf and hastened an adequate settlement.

By 1981 the Thomson organization wanted to sell both papers. That was not surprising: labor unrest had led to soaring costs and deficits. But the choice of Murdoch was a shocker. He already owned the *Sun*, a morning tabloid featuring bare breasts and sensationalism, and the *News of the World*, a Sunday gossip. Evans says that Murdoch's editorial support of Margaret Thatcher saved him from facing a hearing before the Monopolies Commission: "Murdoch had stood by her in the dark days and she was going to stand by him." Instead, the sale was approved, provided Murdoch sign agreements guaranteeing the editorial freedom of the two papers. The new owner could not fire editors without the approval of independently appointed company directors. Urging Evans to switch over to the *Times*, Murdoch said, hyperbolically: "Hell, I'll go to prison if I speak a word to you."

In fact, nothing could stop Murdoch from meddling if he wanted to; the man, after all, owned the papers. Evans claims that interference from the top started almost at once. As he began hearing the new proprietor's complaints that the *Times* was being too harsh on the Thatch-

FICTION

The Anatomy Lesson by Philip Roth. The conclusion of the Nathan Zuckerman trilogy finds Roth's comic writer-hero disillusioned with fiction and headed for medical school and more trouble.

Chronicle of a Death Foretold by Gabriel García Márquez. The 1982 Nobel laureate mixes imagination and fact into a suspenseful novella of honor and revenge in a Colombian town.

Ironweed by William Kennedy. In the third novel set in his native Albany, the author traces a bum's progress through the late Depression and his old upstate New York haunts.

Pitch Dark by Renata Adler. A sophisticated narrator, nearly indistinguishable from the author, uses anecdote and bits of intriguing conversation to reflect on her mobile and solitary life.

Shiloh and Other Stories by Bobbie Ann Mason. *Times* are changing in western Kentucky, the setting for these tales of restless wives, footloose truckers and feisty senior citizens.



NONFICTION

Blue Highways by William Least Heat Moon. After an unhappy marriage, a wanderer takes to the U.S. back roads to examine his country and his American Indian roots.

The Last Lion by William Manchester. One award-winning biographer's highly charged, worshipful narrative of Winston Spencer Churchill's spectacular rise as soldier, author and politician.

Modern Times by Paul Johnson. The crusty former editor of the *New Statesman* blames Einstein, Marx and no-fault liberalism for the evils of the "me" century.

Stieglitz by Sue Davidson Lowe. The photographer's grandniece casts an affectionate, scholarly look back at "Uncle Al," the cantankerous genius who transformed American photography from reproduction to art.

White Mischief by James Fox. As the sun sets luridly on the British Empire, circa 1940, Kenya colonialists go to pieces in a scandalous, riveting tale of murder and retribution.

Books

er government or that the paper had given too much space to events in Poland, Evans had a choice: he could complain to the directors, further provoking Murdoch, or he could hope things would get better. These bad times lasted twelve months, long enough for memory to lapse. Evans quotes Murdoch: "I give instructions to my editors all round the world, why shouldn't I in London?"

A disingenuous but good question. For all of its vehemence, Evans' brief against Murdoch is not wholly convincing. No evidence is presented that the owner ordered a story to run or dictated an editorial position. Evans complains that he was never given a clear budget and that this financial uncertainty affected his news judgment. But the *Times* was losing money when Murdoch bought it, a condition that did not keep him from urging Evans to hire the best journalists he could find. Evans also says that, near the end, his own secretary was spying on him, reporting on his visitors to the man Murdoch wanted as the next editor. This betrayal suggests a level of staff resentment against Evans that he does not explain.

Good Times, Bad Times is valuable for its picture of life at the apex of British journalism: the dinners at 10 Downing Street, the visits to Buckingham Palace, the daily struggle to put out what is still England's newspaper of record. The book also chronicles the inevitable conflict between two volatile men. Evans thought his distinguished record at the *Sunday Times* would force Murdoch to leave him alone; Murdoch did not like being ignored by an employee. There were chips on both shoulders, and they fell exactly where they had to. —By Paul Gray

Founding Son

LAFAYETTE: HERO OF TWO WORLDS

by Olivier Bernier
Dutton; 356 pages; \$19.95

Timid, tongue-tied, earnest to a fault, Gilbert de La Fayette did not seem bound for glory. He embarrassed himself on horseback, stumbled on the dance floor. But he had a fine old name, and after his father died when Gilbert was two years old and his mother when he was twelve, Gilbert came into a handsome fortune. Hating court life in the Versailles of Louis XV, the marquis went into the army. At 19, with only the briefest of military training, he set off to become a hero of the American Revolution.

Lafayette's gallant service to the young nation helped contribute to the special affection that still binds the two countries. Yet as Olivier Bernier, an American author born of French parents, points out in this stirring biography, the French did not always have special affection for Lafayette.

Lafayette first shocked his country-



Portrait of Lafayette

Trying to be the French Washington.

men by stealing off to America against the King's wishes. But he quickly won the friendship of George Washington, spent \$3 million of his own funds on the colonial cause and performed bravely at Brandywine and Yorktown. When word of his exploits reached home, he became a drawing-room sensation. Beautiful women pursued him upon his return, and Louis XVI was even moved to authorize French aid for the Americans. Lafayette had convinced his countrymen, as he wrote in 1777, that "America's happiness is intimately linked to that of mankind."

Throughout his New World adventure, however, Lafayette remained curiously immune to the principles he was fighting for. "It had not yet occurred to him that democracy was for export," writes Bernier. The soldier returned to France an enthusiastic supporter of the *ancien régime*. Yet as the toast of Paris salons, he met some of the new egalitarian thinkers of the day and became a genuine convert to the cause of democracy. His new ideals and his ever growing popularity drew him into the French Revolution, and at 31 he became vice president of the new National Assembly the day before the Bastille was stormed. By trying to give the monarchy a republican patina, however, he earned the enmity of both commoners and nobility. As the Revolution turned bloody, he fled across Austrian lines toward Belgium but was imprisoned. Austria and Prussia considered him a dangerous insurrectionary influence.

Lafayette here becomes a tale of high heroism, not by the marquis but by his quiet, self-effacing wife Adrienne. As relatives were falling to the guillotine all around her and the family's assets were confiscated, she responded with Fayetteesque valor. Briefly imprisoned, Adrienne found food and housing for her family, began caring for destitute friends—including her husband's mis-

tress—and waged a vigorous letter-writing campaign to win his freedom.

Returned to France, the marquis remained on the margins of politics until he was 72, when the nation turned to him for leadership after the 1830 rising against Charles X. But Lafayette dithered in restoring order. The Duc d'Orléans emerged to become King Louis-Philippe and forced Lafayette to resign as commander of the National Guard. "The sad truth was, no one really disliked Lafayette," says Bernier, "but no one wanted him back." He managed to stay in the spotlight, however, speaking out forcefully for such causes as free public education, independence movements in Greece and Poland and the perfection of French democracy. He died in 1834 at 76, surrounded by his family and pressing a medallion of Adrienne to his lips.

A naive egotist, a vain philanderer, a dilettante who often preferred attention to responsibility—the marquis was hardly the complete hero. But his generosity was immense, and he was admired by one of history's great figures. *Lafayette* is the tale of a boy who lost his father at age two and at 19 found a magnificent replacement: George Washington, who dominated the American Revolution and its young visitor. After helping the U.S. gain independence, Lafayette spent a lifetime trying to be the French Washington, attempting to transfer the American ideal of freedom to his brightened land and to act with the principled courage of his mentor. Pretending to be great, the marquis eventually learned to behave nobly. In the end, Lafayette was not France's gift to America, but America's gift to France—and to the idea of liberty. —By Donald Morrison

Armageddon

LIFE AND TIMES OF MICHAEL K

by J.M. Coetzee
Viking; 184 pages; \$13.95

In previous novels (*In the Heart of the Country*, *Waiting for the Barbarians*), J.M. Coetzee turned his apocalyptic eye on his native South Africa. The subjects of his books—race war, state violence and personal vengeance—had a distinctive local color. Now the Afrikaner author goes straight to the center of mankind's lust for self-destruction. The scene of *Life and Times of Michael K* is only incidentally South Africa. The subject is terminal civil war; the time is the end of the world.

In Coetzee's allegory, lawless street gangs have seized devastated cities; ferocious insurgents infest the countryside, blowing up railway tracks, mining the roads and attacking farmsteads; bands of robbers on the highways prey on the hun-



J.M. Coetzee

There's more to John Hancock than life insurance.


Financial planning shouldn't begin with the latest financial fad.

While other institutions are putting a lot of money and marketing effort behind new investment vehicles, we offer something much more substantial: our 120 years of sound investment experience.

It's the same reputation, in fact, that we put behind every service we offer—from tax plans to IRA's and other retirement programs. We can even help you with auto and home insurance.

Businesses turn to John Hancock for employee benefit programs that include group life and health plans, corporate pension and profit-sharing plans. We also offer experience in investment banking and venture capital opportunities, as well as capital equipment leasing and financing.


The ability to provide many financial services doesn't happen overnight. It's the difference between a fad and a solid foundation. That's why you should contact your John Hancock companies representative today.



John Hancock
companies

We can help you here and now. Not just hereafter.

John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company, Boston, MA 02117 and affiliated companies.
John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company, John Hancock Distributors, Inc., John Hancock Financial Services, Inc.,
John Hancock Variable Life Insurance Company, HANSECO Insurance Company, John Hancock Venture Capital Management, Inc.,
Tucker Anthony & R. L. Day, Inc., New York/Boston and affiliated companies, all of Boston, Massachusetts 02117.



© The Upjohn Company 1983

A century

From generation to generation, diabetes is carried on by the inevitable force of genetic predestination. But Upjohn is working to change that destiny.

Since the 1950's, The Upjohn Company has been developing medicines to help the diabetic. Our first oral anti-diabetes drug was a pioneer in the field. Since then we've been in the forefront of treatment for Type II diabetes, which affects more than 85% of all

diabetics.

But to the people at Upjohn, health care reaches far beyond helping people live with disease. We'd like to see everyone living without it.

Through our Chinese hamster colony, the only one in the U.S. devoted solely to



of caring.

diabetes research, we have made significant discoveries about the relationship between diabetes and nutrition.

And recent research has shown that instead of having inadequate insulin levels, many diabetics in fact have inadequate levels of insulin receptors—tiny mechanisms

on cells that are supposed to detect and grasp insulin from the blood.

So Upjohn scientists are working to find ways to increase these receptors in diabetics so their bodies can take full advantage of the insulin which is there.

The job of The Upjohn

Company is never to be satisfied with the status quo.

For nearly 100 years, we've searched for new answers to help improve the quality of life. And searching for more will make our second century of caring even more exciting than the first.

For booklet "What You Should Know About Diabetes," write CARING, Department DT, P.O. Box 2497, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49003.

Upjohn



The low-tar cigarette
that changed smoking.

Reach for a world of flavor.
MERIT



Warning: The Surgeon General Has Determined
That Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Your Health.

© Philip Morris Inc. 1987

8 mg "tar," 0.6 mg nicotine av. per cigarette, FTC Report Mar '83

Books

dreds of thousands of refugees who have been driven from their homes. The government tries to keep order through a system of forced-labor camps, gulags of the veld where prisoners are obliged to sing patriotic songs while being worked to death.

Michael K, the hero of this fearful fable, is a South African of unspecified color. A gardener in a Cape Town public park, he has a harelip and a reputation for feeble-mindedness that mask his true nature: he is a man as meek and lowly in heart as a latter-day Messiah. Coetzee calls him "the obscurest of the obscure, so obscure as to be a prodigy." As his life and times unfold, it becomes clear that his prodigiousness lies in his ability to continue to celebrate life in the midst of the most malignant chaos.

When war strikes, Michael K flees burned-out Cape Town on foot, wheeling his sick mother Anna in an improvised wheelbarrow. Their ordeal is infernal. Hounded by the police and by thieves, the pair get as far as a hospital, where Anna dies. Michael K is stripped of his money; all he has left is a cardboard box filled with his mother's ashes. Undeterred, he moves on to the place of his dreams, the abandoned farm on the arid South African tablelands of the Karoo, where his mother was born. There he scatters Anna's ashes, and there too he plants a handful of pumpkin and melon seeds. On the deserted land the fruits flourish, round and warm as children. Michael K changes. He feels bound to the land, even as he anticipates the inevitable stigmata. "I am becoming a different kind of man, he thought . . . If I were cut, he thought, holding his wrists out, looking at his wrists, the blood would no longer gush from me but seep, and after a little seeping dry and heal. If I were to die here . . . I would be dried out by the wind in a day, I would be preserved whole, like someone in the desert drowned in sand."

Michael K's "sacred garden" is trampled down by the police, who suspect him of terrorism. Seized and imprisoned, Michael K refuses to eat. A physician in the labor camp muses, "Maybe he only eats the bread of freedom." Still, Michael K has preserved a few seeds from the catastrophe. Though utterly emaciated, this wisp of a human creature slips away from his oppressors, so that he may live and die beside his pumpkin seeds. Coetzee mourns Michael K: "A creature that spends its waking life stooped over the soil, that when at last its time comes digs its own grave and slips quietly in and draws the heavy earth over its head like a blanket."

The author seems to be asking: "Shall the meek inherit the earth?" Like any other profound allegory, *Life and Times of Michael K* leaves the question it poses unanswered. But the warning it sounds of Armageddon resonates with uncommon power.

—By Patricia Blake

New from Radio Shack!

THE TRANSPORTABLE TRS-80® COMPUTER



For Today's Upwardly Mobile Society

The TRS-80 Model 4P. Our newest TRS-80 is a compact, disk-based desktop computer with a big difference: it has a handle. That means you can get a handle on all your sales projections, reports and memos no matter where your work takes you!

A Portable, Self-Contained System. Model 4P is packed with features, including two 184K disk drives, 64K internal memory, a full 80-character by 24-line 9" display and an electric typewriter-quality keyboard. It's only 26 pounds and works anywhere there's AC.

Use "Off the Shelf" Software. In addition to TRS-80 Model III/4 disk software, you can add the optional CP/M Plus™ operating system to use thousands of additional programs.

Backed by the World's Largest Computer Retailer. We have training, leasing and service plans as well as printers, software and other accessories for expanding your Model 4P. So stop by your nearest Radio Shack Computer Center, participating store or dealer today and discover where Model 4P will take you.



Radio Shack®

The biggest name in little computers®
A DIVISION OF TANDY CORPORATION

Model 4P Computer
179900
26-1080
Commercial Lease Available
For Only \$25 Per Month
(Plus Applicable Use/Sales Tax)

Send me your free TRS-80 Computer Catalog today!

NAME _____
COMPANY _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____
STATE _____ ZIP _____
TELEPHONE _____

Mail To: Radio Shack
Dept. 84-A-655
300 One Tandy Center
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

Prices apply at participating Radio Shack stores and dealers. CP/M Plus is a trademark of Digital Research.

Theater

Digging for the Roots

Two musicals limn the troubles and triumphs of blacks

In white America, a black man's otherness is stamped indelibly on his face. Whether he runs the 100-meter dash or runs for President, whether he orates like Martin Luther King Jr. or drawls like Stepin Fetchit, his color sets him apart. For him the American melting pot can sear faster than it assimilates. And so he looks to his roots, finding solace in soul, while fixing an eye on the main chance of upward mobility. His tragedy is that, in both worlds, he may end up a stranger.

One new Broadway musical not only addresses this dilemma, it seems to share it. *The Tap Dance Kid* may sound like the saga of young Bojangles Robinson, but it is really *A Tree Grows in Brooklyn* in blackface and with the priorities reversed. Its subject is the aspirations and frustrations of the black middle class. Daddy (Samuel E. Wright) is a successful lawyer, living in a Manhattan duplex with his wife Ginnie (Hattie Winston), their 13-year-old daughter Emma (Martine Allard) and their ten-year-old son Willie (Alfonso Ribeiro). Emma wants to be an attorney; Willie just gotta dance, under the eager tutorial eye of his raffish uncle Dipsey (Hinton Battle). If Dad is willing to indulge Emma's career goal, he is adamant that Willie will never put on taps. "We didn't get off the plantation," he argues in a quick history lesson, "until we stopped dancin' and started doin'."

When this show starts dancing, it does just fine. Danny Daniels' spunky chorus line works up a lovely sweat in one num-

ber (*Fabulous Feet*) that piles climax upon exhilarating climax; in another (*Dance If It Makes You Happy*), Willie dreams of tapping his cares away in the company of Bojangles, Astaire and the entire MGM back lot. Battle, a natural-born Broadway stunner, captivates the audience with an electrifying spirit that surges from his head to all ten toes. But the other family members are often deadly serious; they express themselves in Composer Henry



Four fabulous feet: Battle and Ribeiro

Krieger's capacious Tin Pan arias, which haunt the ear without paying much more than lip service to the Afro rhythms that energized his *Dreamgirls* score. In the final gasp of the show's schizophrenia, young Willie comes to a perverse decision about the show he has dreamed of appearing in. It satisfies his parents but not a Broadway musical audience. How could it when a tap-dance kid says, in effect, "I won't dance, don't ask me"?

Across the East River from the Great White Way, some 60 gospel shouters are shaking the Brooklyn Academy of Music with the soaring sounds of religious fervor. *The Gospel at Colonus* is an unlikely enterprise: the story of Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* as it might be enacted by a black evangelical congregation on a splendid Sunday morning. Sophocles' theme was man's acceptance of the inevitability of death; Adapter-Director Lee Breuer's is the black man's and woman's reconciliation to a hard life in these United States. If Breuer's staging is occasionally drab and tentative, Composer Bob Telson's score displays an inventive fidelity to traditional blues and spirituals.

The large cast would make a true believer of any prissy infidel. Clarence Fountain, leading the Five Blind Boys of Alabama, incarnates the eyesless Theban exile with a savage lyricism. Carolyn White, singing the inspirational *Lift Him Up*, merges volume and discipline and an awesome range. And Carl Williams Jr. cheerleads the Institutional Radio Choir toward communal ecstasy. Implicitly, the *Gospel* performers offer some sage advice to their troubled musical relatives on Broadway: If you can't tap-dance your way to assimilation, then sing out your uniqueness in a joyous noise.

—By Richard Corliss

Brighton Beach Memoirs. Neil Simon mixes slapstick and sentiment in his autobiographical play about an American family, that secret society where the passwords are *forgive and remember*.

La Cage aux Folles. The one megahit musical in a torpid Broadway season, Harvey Fierstein's gay valentine boasts a spectacular turn by George Hearn, as a Saint-Tropez drag queen, and sfirefire Jerry Herman songs that might have been composed on a calliope.

Fen and Top Girls. In the first, five women till the harsh swampland of Norfolk; in the second, a Thatcherese career woman chats with her peers from throughout history. In both, British Feminist Caryl Churchill displays acerbic ironies and dazzling technique.

Galas. Or: *The Life and Hard Times of Maria Callas*. Leave it to off-off-Broadway's Charles Ludlam—playwright, producer, director and, in the title role, every inch a diva—to put the art back into *commedia dell'arte*.

Isn't It Romantic. Wendy Wasserstein looks at two sisters under the skin—one a WASP princess, the other a Jewish frogette—in an irresistible off-Broadway comedy about coming to terms with endearment.



My One and Only. A trunkful of Gershwin songs, colorful sets from a wise child's kindergarten and a pair of toe-tapping charmers in Twiggy and Tommy Tune make for Broadway's airiest enchantment.

'night, Mother. A young woman announces her intention to commit suicide; her mom uses every diaphanous prevaricator. Marsha Norman's Pulitzer prizewinner is equally entertaining and harrowing; in the only roles, Kathy Bates and Anne Pitoniak shine with love and anger.

Painting Churches. The twilight of life, the dawn of senility: Chekhov comes to Bea-

con Hill in Tina Howe's sweet, zesty off-Broadway comedy. **Passion.** The Jekyll of respectability duels with the Hyde of libido. Peter Nichols' unsettling domestic comedy survived a ragged Broadway production with many of its virtues (and Actress Roxanne Hart's Circean charms) intact.

Quartermaine's Term. Quartermaine, an aging instructor at an English school for foreigners, is one of nature's near misses: a decent mediocrity, for whom other people's cries are mere whispers in the anteroom of his mind. In Remak Ramsay's off-Broadway performance, Simon Gray's British import found the perfect pitch of melancholy.

Cinema

The Good Word

REUBEN, REUBEN
Directed by Robert Ellis Miller
Screenplay by Julius J. Epstein

Why are so few substantial novels made into movies these days? Perhaps because the printed page is a dominatrix of the imagination, demanding that the reader conjure up worlds from words, that he become a hard-working co-conspirator in the creative experience. Celluloid, by comparison, is a laissez-faire baby sitter. It asks only that the viewer believe what he sees, that he go with the flow of seductive images and return to intellectual infancy as a passive, pacified fun sucker. The young audience that makes hits these days out of laser shows and locker-room frolics seems bored with the notion that the mind has a life too. And few moviemakers, even the smart ones, are choosing to exercise their craft for the benefit of anyone old enough to vote.

Credit Producer Walter Shenson (*The Mouse That Roared*, *A Hard Day's Night*) with putting his money where his mind is. He has shepherded Peter De Vries' 1964 novel *Reuben, Reuben* from page to screen; he has made a film for, and about, the over-the-hill gang. The central character of *Reuben, Reuben* is a poet, someone for whom words and even the occasional idle matter. For Gowan Evans McGland (Tom Conti), the English language is a weapon to be used against fools, an aphrodisiac with which to ply faculty wives, and a solace whenever thoughts of suicide dance in his head. Still, words give Gowan problems. His rampant eloquence can prove an embar-



Conti as a down-on-his-art Dylan Thomas: stealing scenes just by being in them

assment, as when one avid matron removes her brassiere and Gowan offers this verbal foreplay: "Released from their support, her breasts drooped like hanged men." And for ages now he has been unable to put words into an order that would constitute a publishable poem. As his rueful ex-wife notes, "Gowan always maintained that what he hated most about writing was the paperwork." So from campus to campus he goes, supporting himself on charm, Celtic invective and waiters' tips stolen from restaurant tables.

Enter Geneva Spofford (Kelly McGillis), blond and gorgeous and irresistibly young, half his age and twice as mature. Can Gowan not have realized that women are attracted to the poor childish male more out of pity than passion? Gowan is hooked. His head, the resting place for a dead Siamese cat of hair, is filled with the stirrings of teen love; and his will, which had always moved by shrugs, now be-

comes a Koren cartoon of shaggy-doggedness. The poet will propose marriage. The nymph will break his heart.

As directed by Robert Ellis Miller, the film ambles along like Gowan, exasperating and endearing by turns. Screenwriter Julius J. Epstein mines De Vries for some daringly "literary" dialogue and fashions a full portrait of Gowan, who was a supporting character in the novel. But *Reuben's* prize jackanapes is Tom Conti. This delightful English actor (TV's *The Norman Conquests*) uses all his honed tools—the dimples, the fluty voice, the hermit-crab walk, the little-boy eyes—to steal every scene just by being in it. Petty and poetic, desperate and delightful, Conti's Gowan is the funniest portrayal of a down-on-his-art genius since Alec Guinness's Gully Jimson in *The Horse's Mouth*. It is certainly reason enough for a grownup to go back to the movies again. —By Richard Corliss

Berlin Alexanderplatz. The harsh twilight of an amiable brute (Gunter Lamprecht) presages the arrival of Nazism's long night. Rainer Werner Fassbinder's mesmerizing 1½-hour film is a masterpiece of social and sexual misanthropy.

The Big Chill. Seven survivors of the '60s meet for a weekend to find a little warmth in the not so simple '80s. Aided by a resourceful cast, Writer-Director Lawrence Kasdan revives some old-fashioned movie virtues: grace, wit, subtlety, style.

Heart Like a Wheel. This B-movie biography of Shirley Muldowney, first woman to become a national hot-rod champion, boasts crisp, compassionate direction by Jonathan Kaplan and an Oscar-worthy performance from Bonnie Bedelia.

The Night of the Shooting Stars. In 1944, a score of Tuscan villagers flee from the Nazis into a landscape of nightmare poetry. Italian Film Makers Paolo and Vittorio Taviani find aspects of nobility in every eccentric peasant.

La Nuit de Varennes. Louis XVI's flight from the French Revolution is acutely observed by Director Ettore Scola, who concludes that history is an accident, ideology an irony, humanity's greatest blessing its distractibility.



Star 80. Coolly, precisely but with hypnotic power, Bob Fosse converts Playmate Dorothy Stratten's murder into a harrowing tragedy of manners and a tale about the killing power of sleazy deals.

Tender Mercies. A country singer touches bottom and finds that it consists of good Texas earth in which he can reerect his humanity. Actor Robert Duvall warms and graces Screenwriter Horton Foote's tale with his lived-in face and a performance as raw as a Hank Williams ballad.

Terms of Endearment. Morals, mortality, even a mid-life crisis or two are all subjects for James L. Brooks' rich, sweet, sad comedy. Shirley MacLaine and Debra Winger strike sparks and smiles as the middle-American mother and daughter.

Yentl. Gotta sing! Gotta dance! Gotta study that Talmud! Filling every function but set decorator on this lavish musical, Barbra Streisand transforms a tale of the shtetl into a moving metaphor for her own determination and talent.

Zelig. Technically bedazzling, Woody Allen's parody of a square-cut documentary is also a hard-edged examination of the way modern celebrity rituals, magnified by the media, bend people's minds and perhaps deaden their hearts.

Show Business

Goodbye to the Ticket Line

Computers are bringing the box office as close as your telephone

Queuing for hours in the sub-freezing cold to buy a pair of hard-to-get tickets may have once been a mark of theatergoing dedication. But increasingly, it is merely a sign that you are behind the times. The old-fashioned box office has, by and large, gone the way of the pin-ball machine and the flesh-and-blood bank teller: computers have moved in. Today ordering tickets for everything from Broadway shows to a Styx concert often requires nothing more arduous than picking up the phone and reading numbers off a credit card.

Ticket selling entered the computer age in 1967, when Ticketron (then known as Ticket Reservation Systems) opened its first neighborhood outlets in New York City. This year the company expects to sell 55 million tickets through its network of 1,200 nationwide outlets and a growing charge-by-phone operation. Meanwhile, new competitors and services are springing up at a rapid pace. A phone call can now get you tickets to museum shows, an evening at New York's Studio 54 disco, a spot at one of California's crowded campsites, or a seat at the Educational Testing Service's next Graduate Record Examination.

Other signs of the times:

► **Chargit**, the nation's first large-scale ticket-by-phone service, has expanded from a mom-and-pop ticket booth in Manhattan's Pennsylvania Station to a 24-hour computerized phone operation



Ticketmaster's Rosen and friends at the Forum in Los Angeles

"Our goal is to make ticket buying as convenient as possible."

that will sell close to 3 million tickets this year, many via its toll-free 800 number. In addition to booking Broadway and off-Broadway shows, sports and other live events, Chargit is trying to spread ticket-by-phone fever to movies. It has already offered phone reservations to such films as *Return of the Jedi* and *Sophie's Choice*.

► In Los Angeles, a full-blown computer-ticket war broke out earlier this year when a scrappy newcomer called Ticketmaster breezed into town and supplanted Ticketron at several key venues, including the Los Angeles Forum. Ticketmaster takes reservations both by phone and through ticket outlets, and

it has just moved the computer-ticket revolution an intriguing step further. For an extra \$15 to \$25, customers can get their ducaats delivered to their door.

SEN MARTIN

► Computer-ticket competition heated up in New York City this fall when Ticket World, a reservation service operating in Detroit, moved into the New York market. It has computerized the box offices of several Broadway shows, and is linking them to more than 70 area locations. And the nation's largest chain of legitimate theaters, the Shubert Organization, has just installed a ticket-by-phone service for all 16 of its Broadway houses, and is extending it to such cities as Boston and Chicago as well.

For customers, the convenience of ordering seats by phone is only slightly tempered by the drawbacks: the service charge typically ranges from \$1.50 to \$2.50 a ticket, and, in most cases, specific seats cannot be guaranteed over the phone. Instead, the customer is promised the "best available" seat, as determined by—what else?—the computer.

For theater and arena operators, however, the advent of computerized ticketing has been a boon. In a 1980 survey taken for the League of New York Theaters and Producers, 39% of the respondents said that charge-by-phone services made them more likely to attend a Broadway show. And attendance at rock concerts received an undoubted boost from the proliferation of Ticketron outlets during the 1970s. Says Ticketmaster Chairman Fred Rosen: "Our goal is to make ticket buying as convenient as possible. And the telephone is the ultimate convenience." ■

Longest Goodbye: The 2½-hour final episode of *M*A*S*H*, telecast by CBS last February to unprecedented ratings, and followed by the Fastest Return: *AfterMASH*, unveiled just seven months later.

Most Enchanted Evening: Sept. 29, when *A Chorus Line* became the longest-running show on Broadway and Director Michael Bennett restaged his musical as a dazzling class reunion of 330 dancing alumni. Is *A Chorus Line* the best-ever Broadway musical? No. But that night it was.

Least Enchanted Ten Weeks: The Broadway revival of *Private Lives*, in which Resistible Force Richard Burton met Immovable Object Elizabeth Taylor, and the play sank in a wave of critical catcalls.

Sexiest Secret Agent: Sean Connery, who returned to play 007 in *Never Say Never Again* and easily beat Mannequin Roger Moore (*Octopussy*) in the battle of the Bonds.

Squeakiest Door: The homosexuality closet on Broadway, which was vividly pried open with the Tony-winning *Torch Song Trilogy* and the hit musical *La Cage aux Folles*.



Saddest Alien: E.T., who found that being box-office champ could not keep him (and his creator Steven Spielberg) from getting trampled in the Oscar race by *Gandhi*.


Happiest Aliens: The extraterrestrials who populated *Return of the Jedi*, the *Star Wars* sequel that took in almost \$300 million at movie theaters in its first six months.

Longest War: ABC's 18-hour *The Winds of...* brought Herman Wouk and a platoon of stars to prime time and proved that, with a \$40 million budget and \$35 million worth of on-air promotion, a mini-series can still snag record numbers of viewers.

Most Versatile Talent: Playwright-Actor Sam Shepard, who scored off-Broadway with his dynamo dramas *True West* and *Fool for Love*, and on-screen as the sexy incarnation of Test Pilot Chuck Yeager in *The Right Stuff*.

Highest Rebound: Bette Midler, who stormed back from a jinxed movie career to recover her standing as Ms. Show Biz with a 50-city concert tour, a cable-TV special, a new album, and a bestselling book, *The Saga of Baby Divine*.

US WHAT WE ARE TODAY HAVE TO BE TOMORROW.



What really defines a company is not to be found on its organizational chart, but in its people.

So, as the organization of the Bell System breaks up, we want to remind you that its spirit remains intact.

Though many Bell people are being reassigned, and will work for companies with new names, they carry with them our 107-year commitment to service and excellence.

Each of us is well aware of the tradition we have to live up to.

Whether we'll be part of the new AT&T or your local Bell telephone company, we all share a legacy which will not—cannot—be divested.



**YOUR LOCAL
BELL COMPANY**

There's only one way to play it.



Wherever
the music is hot,
the taste is KOOL. At any
'tar' level, there's only one
sensation this refreshing.

© 1983 B&W T Co.

Warning: The Surgeon General Has Determined
That Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Your Health.

Lights Kings, 9 mg. "tar", 0.7 mg. nicotine,
Filter Kings, 17 mg. "tar", 1.1 mg. nicotine
av. per cigarette, FTC Report Mar. '83.